NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Union Calendar No. 608

99TH CONGRESS *2d Session*	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	REPORT 99-1023

SAFETY NET PROGRAMS: ARE THEY REACHING POOR CHILDREN?

A REPORT

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

together with

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS

DECEMBER 1986

DECEMBER 18, 1986.--Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
66-312 O WASHINGTON : 1986

H963-5

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, Louisiana
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, New York
TED WEISS, New York
BERYL ANTHONY, Jr., Arkansas
BARBARA BOXER, California
SANDER M. LEVIN, Michigan
BRUCE A. MORRISON, Connecticut
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota
ALAN WHEAT, Missouri
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
LANE EVANS, Illinois

DAN COATS, Indiana
HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York
THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr., Virginia
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
NANCY L. JOHNSON, Connecticut
JOHN R. McKERNAN, Jr., Maine
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, Nevada
DAVID S. MONSON, Utah
ROBERT C. SMITH, New Hampshire
WILLIAM W. COBEY, Jr., North Carolina

Committee Staff

Alan J. Stone, *Staff Director and Counsel*
Ann Rosewater, *Deputy Staff Director*
Mark Souder, *Minority Staff Director*

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
J. ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
GERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS

ALAN J. STONE
STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL
ANN ROSEWATER
DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 House Office Building Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515

DAN COATS, INDIANA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
HAMILTON FISH, JR., NEW YORK
THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
NANCY L. JOHNSON, CONNECTICUT
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., MAINE
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
DAVID S. MONSON, UTAH
ROBERT C. SMITH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM W. COBEY, JR., NORTH CAROLINA

[illegible]
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE 226-7692

December 18, 1986

The Hon. Benjamin J. Guthrie
Clerk
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Guthrie:

We are pleased to transmit the enclosed three reports entitled "A Report on the Activities for the Year 1985 of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, 99th Congress, First Session," "Teen Pregnancy: What Is Being Done? A State-By-State Look," and "Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children?"

These reports, which are transmitted in accordance with Section 6(a) of House Resolution 25, summarize some of the major findings of the Committee during the First and Second Sessions of the 99th Congress.

These reports will be followed by another document entitled "Activities Report for the Year 1986 of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, 99th Congress, Second Session."

Respectfully submitted.

Sincerely,

George Miller

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman

Enclosures

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION v

FINDINGS vii

Chapter I: Children in Poverty 1

Table I-1: Poverty Status of Related Children Under 18 by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984 3

Table I-2: Poverty Status of Related Children Under Six by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984 6

Table I-3: Shifts in Child Poverty: 1979-1984 8

Table I-4: Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties 11

Chapter II: Children's Participation Across Programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Head Start, and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) 13

Chapter III: Children's Participation in AFDC: 1979-1984.......... 25

Table III-1: AFDC Participation Rates for Low-Income Children by Region: 1979 and 1984 27

Table III-2: Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by State and Region: 1979 and 1984 28

Table III-3: Summary by State: 1984 AFDC High Participation Counties 33

Table III-4: Summary by State: 1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties 34

Table III-5: 1984 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State 35

Table III-6: 1979 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State 37

Table III-7: Summary by State: 1979 AFDC High Participation Counties 40

Table III-8: Summary by State: 1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties 41

Table III-9: Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State: 1979, 1984, and 1985.......... 44

Table III-10: Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC Benefits and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children by State: 1979 49

Table III-11: AFDC Need Standard and Payment Standard for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985 51

Chapter IV: Children's Participation in Head Start: 1984 55
Table IV-1: Summary by State: Children Participating in Head Start 57
Table IV-2: Summary by State: 1984 Head Start High Participation Counties 59
Table IV-3: Summary by State: 1984 Head Start Low Participation Counties 60
Table IV-4: 1984 Head Start Participation Scores and Rank by State 61
Chapter V: Children's Participation in WIC: 1984 65
Table V-1: Summary by State: Children Participating in WIC .. 67
Table V-2: Summary by State: 1984 WIC High Participation Counties 69
Table V-3: Summary by State: 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties 70
Table V-4: 1984 WIC Participation Scores and Rank by State ... 72

APPENDICES

Appendix A: How the Data Were Obtained 77
Appendix B: Methods of Analysis 87
Appendix C: How the Programs Operate 93
Appendix D: Child Poverty Counties 107
Appendix E: Tables Relating to Participation Across All Programs.. 113
Appendix F: Tables Relating to Participation in AFDC 139
Appendix G: Tables Relating to Participation in Head Start 269
Appendix H: Tables Relating to Participation in WIC 287
Appendix I: Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) 301
Appendix J: Sample Letters Requesting AFDC and WIC Data 305
Appendix K: Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985) Dollars 309

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS

Dissenting Minority Views by Hon. Dan Coats, Ranking Minority Member; Hon. Thomas Bliley, Jr.; Hon. Frank Wolf; Hon. Barbara Vucanovich; Hon. David Monson; Hon. Robert Smith; Hon. Bill Cobey 312

ADDITIONAL DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS

Additional Dissenting Minority Views by Hon. Nancy L. Johnson, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., Hon. John R. McKernan, Jr. 351

INTRODUCTION

The addition of nearly 3 million children to the poverty rolls since 1979 has been a matter of deepest concern to this Committee. Now, 12.5 million children in America -- one-in-five -- are impoverished.

This report is about the condition of the "safety net" designed to protect these children.

Our principal finding is that the record growth in poverty among children has not been accompanied by increased availability of key safety net programs. To the contrary, support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need, are not most available where child poverty is greatest, and in two of the three programs studied, are reaching a lower percentage of impoverished children than before the increase in poverty.

We compared the number of children below the poverty line in each U.S. county (using 1980 Census data, the most recent available) with the number of impoverished children reached in 1984 by three critical programs. We used county-level data because it provides the sharpest possible snapshot of children's economic circumstances and program participation. We did not "weight" counties for population density. Rather, we treat each county equally, and each impoverished child in each county as deserving of the supports provided by these programs.

The programs studied are: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the only federal-state entitlement program of income supports to low-income families (66% of AFDC recipients are children); Head Start, a grant program which provides intensive pre-school education services, and which has been very successful; and, WIC (the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children), a grant program which provides high protein foods and access to health care, saving both lives and dollars.1/

In this report we have been conservative in our methods, using only those programs where up-to-date participation figures for children at the county level were available. Major federal programs serving impoverished children, including Food Stamps, Medicaid, and Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, are not included in this study for that reason. When it became necessary to use 1980 Decennial Census poverty data as a proxy for 1984 poverty data, we designed our analysis to minimize the likelihood of any distortions.

Without such an analysis, however, there is no way to determine whether impoverished children are getting the necessary supports provided in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC, and, as the level of need increases, where gaps in services are greatest. That county-level child poverty data are available only every ten years is a source of great frustration to us. We are unwilling to wait until the 1990 Census to take the measure of low-income children's wellbeing which is made possible through this analysis.

Experts differ on which factors have played the most significant role in the recent increase in child poverty. Inadequate family

---

1/ See especially, "Opportunities for Success: Cost-Effective Programs for Children," Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, U.S. House of Representatives, August 1985.

income, the obvious cause of child poverty, can result from job loss, unemployment, underemployment, and changes in family composition. In order to better understand the recent increase in child poverty, we have asked the Congressional Budget Office to prepare a detailed analysis of the dynamics of the low-income population and larger economic and demographic patterns.

Whatever the causes, however, children are impoverished through no fault of their own, and should have adequate and equal access to basic supports and services, regardless of where they live.

Some have suggested that the private, nonprofit sector can fill the gaps in services to children. Nothing could be further from the truth. Every nonprofit representative appearing before us has testified, and studies conducted by the Urban Institute's Nonprofit Sector Project have verified, that they will never be able to fill the gaps, that they too have lost billions in resources for children and families as a result of federal budget cuts.1/ This is true in spite of greatly increased efforts on behalf of volunteers and contributors.

We are heartened that in 1985 and 1986 -- this study began in 1985 using the most recent 1984 data -- both Head Start and WIC have been extended to more counties. Even with these increases, however, the vast majority of low-income children continue to go unserved by these two vital programs.

It is this reality which we must honestly confront as the debate over welfare reform, family policy, and deficit reduction sharpens in the coming months.

There are no doubt ways to improve each of these programs, but we would be foolish to waste our time building new bureaucracies or launching yet more "pilot" programs when we have proven programs that have been reduced during a time of need.

If we were only to use the tools available, millions more children would have a chance to be healthier, more academically successful, and more economically secure. If that is not one principal goal of welfare reform, it is difficult to imagine what is.

The opportunity to excel should be every American child's birthright, not an accident of where they live, or the policies of the moment. As this study shows, this laudable goal is falling ever farther from our grasp.

1/ See especially, Abramson, Alan J. and Salamon, Lester M., "The Nonprofit Sector and the New Federal Budget," The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Signed:
George Miller, Chairman
William Lehman
Patricia Schroeder
Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs
Matthew F. McHugh
Ted Weiss
Beryl Anthony, Jr.
Barbara Boxer
Sander M. Levin
Bruce A. Morrison
J. Roy Rowland
Gerry Sikorski
Alan Wheat
Matthew G. Martinez
Lane Evans

FINDINGS

Millions More Impoverished Children

- In 1984, nearly 13 million American children were impoverished, an increase of 3 million (29 percent) since 1979.1/ Children under six fell into poverty at the fastest rate. Black children and children of Spanish origin continued to have the highest rates of poverty, however, 2 million of the "newly poor" were white children.2/ The Midwest recorded the highest number of "newly poor" children, and the highest rate of increase in child poverty during this period.

Programs Remain Unavailable to Most Impoverished Children

- In 1984, only one-in-seven poor children participated in Head Start, one-in-three participated in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and one-in-two participated in Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Percentage of Impoverished Children Served Drops in 2 of 3 Programs

- While the number of impoverished children rose dramatically between 1979 and 1984, the percentage of poor children served nationwide by AFDC fell by 22 percent and the percentage enrolled in Head Start declined by 25 percent. The percentage receiving WIC services grew by 22 percent.

Counties with Highest Child Poverty Not Getting Important Children's Programs

In those counties with the highest rates of child poverty,3/ the study examined impoverished children's participation in three critical federal support programs -- AFDC, Head Start and WIC:

- In 1984, fewer than 1 percent of these counties also had high participation among impoverished children in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC.4/ No more than 8 percent of these counties had high participation among low-income children in two of the programs.

- In 1984, over 150 of these counties had no Head Start program; and 40 of these counties had no WIC program.

Wide Disparities Among States In Serving Impoverished Children

- Using the best scale to date for determining current statewide participation,5/ it is clear that wide disparities still exist in the success various states have in providing AFDC, Head Start, and WIC to children at or below the poverty level. The top ten states score over 3-1/2 times higher on this scale with regard to AFDC participation than the ten worst states. With regard to Head Start and WIC participation, the top ten states score 2-1/2 times higher on this scale than the lowest ten states.

Impoverished Children Losing Income Supports

- Between 1979 and 1984, the number of children receiving AFDC benefits declined in 30 states.
- Between 1979 and 1984, 175,000 fewer poverty-level children received AFDC benefits in counties with the highest rates of child poverty, a 10 percent decline.
- For those impoverished children receiving AFDC benefits, the inflation-adjusted value of AFDC payments declined in 49 states, with the average maximum benefit falling 17 percent.

1/ In 1984, the official poverty line for a four-person family was $10,609. Children living in families at or below this level, adjusted for family size, are officially considered poor.

2/ In 1985, there were no statistically significant changes in the number of black or white children, or children of Spanish origin in poverty, or in the poverty rates for these groups. This was true for all children under 18 and children under six.

3/ High child poverty counties were defined as the 20 percent of all U.S. counties estimated in the 1980 Decennial Census to have the highest child poverty rates. In each county, 25 percent or more of all children lived in families with incomes at or below the official poverty level.

4/ Counties with high particpation were those in the top 20 percent when the number of poor children receiving program services in a county was compared to the number of poor children in the county as estimated in the 1980 Decennial Census. Low participation counties were those in the bottom 20 percent.

5/ All states were rated on their overall level of program participation by children at or below the poverty level. Ratings were based on the percentage of counties in each state that had high levels of program participation minus the percentage of counties with low program participation.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Between 1979 and 1984, nearly 3 million more children fell into poverty, an increase of almost 30 percent from 10 million to 12.9 million. The overall child poverty rate increased from 16 to 21 percent, a 31 percent rise (p. 2).

- Minority children remained disproportionately poor. However, more than 2 million of the children who fell into poverty during this period were white children (p. 4).

- The greatest increase in both the number of poor children and the poverty rate for children between 1979 and 1984 occurred in the Midwest. Poverty among midwestern children increased by over 1 million, or by 60 percent, and the poverty rate went from 11 percent to 16 percent, a 41 percent rise (p. 5).

- In 1979 and 1984, poverty rates for children under six for all racial/ethnic groups were consistently higher than for all children under 18. The rate of increase in the number of young, low-income children between 1979 and 1984 was faster than for all children. Over 1.5 million children under six became impoverished, a 45 percent increase. The poverty rate for these children rose from 17.8 percent to 23.4 percent, a 31 percent increase (pp. 5, 7).

- New trends emerged with respect to those groups of children with the highest poverty rates. For example, the group of children under 18 with the highest poverty rate shifted from black children in the South (44 percent in 1979 and 1984) to children of Spanish origin in the Northeast (43 percent in 1979 to 55 percent in 1984) (p. 7).

- Black children under six in the Midwest had the highest poverty rate of any group of children (under six and under 18) in 1984. Nearly two-thirds of these children (63.4 percent) began their lives in poverty (p. 9).

CHAPTER I: CHILDREN IN POVERTY

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TRENDS IN POVERTY: 1979 - 1984

This section analyzes national and regional trends in the number of impoverished children and in children's poverty rates between 1979 and 1984. Data are presented for all children under 18 years of age, white and black children, and children of Spanish origin, who can be of any race. Shifts in poverty among children under six are also described.

Child Poverty in 1984: Dramatic Increases in Five Years

Between 1979 and 1984, the number of impoverished children increased significantly across the Nation.[1/]

In 1979, nearly 10 million children (16 percent) in America were poor (Table I-1). By 1984, nearly 3 million more children had fallen into poverty, an increase of almost 30 percent. The poverty rate for all children in 1984, 21 percent, was the highest it has been since 1964, except for the recession years of 1982 (21.3 percent) and 1983 (21.8 percent).

In 1979, poverty rates for black and white children, and children of Spanish origin varied widely. While there were more than 2 million more poor white children than black children in 1979, the poverty rate for black children, 40.8 percent, was over 3-1/2 times the rate for white children, 11.4 percent. The rate for children of Spanish origin, 27.7 percent, was nearly 2-1/2 times the rate for white children.

[1/] In August, 1986, U.S. Census Bureau released poverty figures for 1985. Numbers of children in poverty and child poverty rates did not change appreciably from 1984 levels.

TABLE I-1
POVERTY STATUS OF RELATED CHILDREN UNDER 18 BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN: 1979 and 1984
(Numbers in thousands)

UNDER 18	1979			1984			Absolute Change		Percent Change	
Region, Race & Spanish Origin	Total	# Below Poverty	% Below Poverty	Total	# Below Poverty	% Below Poverty	Total	Below Poverty	Total	Below Poverty
United States										
All races	62,646	9,994	16.0	61,680	12,929	21.0	-966	2,935	-1.5	29.4
White	51,687	5,909	11.4	50,190	8,086	16.1	-1,497	2,177	-2.9	36.8
Black	9,172	3,746	40.8	9,355	4,320	46.2	183	574	2.0	15.3
Spanish Origin	5,426	1,504	27.7	5,983	2,317	38.7	557	813*	10.3	54.1
Northeast										
All races	13,064	2,013	15.4	12,121	2,486	20.5	-943	473	-7.2	23.5
White	11,119	1,369	12.3	10,186	1,675	16.4	-933	306	-8.4	22.3
Black	1,696	611	36.0	1,673	764	45.7	-23	153	-1.4	25.0
Spanish Origin	964	418	43.4	1,069	588	55.0	105	170*	10.9	40.7
Midwest										
All races	16,503	2,088	12.6	16,055	3,291	20.5	-448	1,203	-2.7	57.6
White	14,393	1,291	9.0	13,880	2,196	15.8	-513	905	-3.6	70.1
Black	1,876	754	40.2	1,900	1,029	54.2	24	275	1.3	36.5
Spanish Origin	489	100	20.4	584	228	39.0	95	128*	19.4	128.0
South										
All races	21,261	4,319	20.3	20,921	4,789	22.9	-340	470	-1.6	10.9
White	16,059	2,083	13.0	15,542	2,476	15.9	-517	393	-3.2	18.9
Black	4,898	2,168	44.3	5,027	2,233	44.4	129	65	2.6	3.0
Spanish Origin	1,642	477	29.0	1,846	632	34.2	204	155*	12.4	32.5
West										
All races	11,818	1,574	13.3	12,583	2,363	18.8	765	789	6.5	50.1
White	10,116	1,166	11.5	10,582	1,739	16.4	466	573	4.6	49.1
Black	702	213	30.3	755	294	38.9	53	81	7.5	38.0
Spanish Origin	2,331	509	21.8	2,484	869	35.0	153	360*	6.6	70.7

* A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

Source: 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys, U.S. Bureau of the Census

The percentages of children in poverty also varied significantly by region in 1979. The lowest child poverty rate was in the Midwest (12.6 percent), the highest in the South (20.3 percent). Black children in the South had the highest rate of poverty of any group of children under 18 in any region, 44.3 percent, followed by children of Spanish origin in the Northeast, 43.4 percent. White children in the Midwest had the lowest poverty rate of any group, 9 percent.

By 1984 the picture had changed considerably.

The vast majority of the "newly poor" children were white children. There were over 2 million more white children living in impoverished families in 1979 than in 1984, a 37 percent increase.

The poverty rate for white children increased from 11.4 percent to 16.1 percent, a 41 percent rise. The pace at which the rate rose for white children was nearly equaled by children of Spanish origin, whose poverty rate rose from 27.7 percent to 38.7 percent, or by 40 percent.

In 1984, black children continued to have the highest rate of poverty among the three racial/ethnic groups. However, over the five-year span, both the number of black children falling into poverty, and the rate of increase in the percentage of children in poverty for this group, was the lowest among the three groups. The poverty rate for black children rose from 40.8 percent in 1979 to 46.2 percent in 1984, or by 13 percent.

Of the 12.9 million children in poverty in 1984, 8.1 million were white, 4.3 million black, and 2.3 million were of Spanish origin.

Finally, during the period between 1979 and 1984, poverty rates for children under six in each region and for each racial/ethnic group were consistently higher than for the entire group of children under 18 (Table I-2).

Rate of Increase Varies by Region; New Patterns Emerge

Every region in the country experienced an increase in child poverty between 1979 and 1984.

By far, however, the greatest increase among poor children occurred in the Midwest. Over 1 million more midwestern children lived in poor families in 1984 than in 1979, an increase of nearly 60 percent.

In the Midwest, there were 275,000 more low-income black children (36.5 percent increase), 900,000 more low-income white children (70 percent increase), and 128,000 more poor children of Spanish origin (128 percent increase), more than doubling the 1979 figure.1/

Child poverty also rose by nearly 800,000 or by over 50 percent in the West. In the West, there were 80,000 more black children in poverty (38 percent increase), 570,000 more white children (49 percent increase) and 360,000 more children of Spanish origin (71 percent increase).

In the Northeast, close to 1/2 million children fell into poverty, nearly a 25 percent increase. Of these children, 150,000 were black children (25 percent increase), 300,000 were white children (22 percent

---

1/ A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

TABLE I-2
Poverty Status of Related Children Under Six by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984
(Numbers in Thousands)

UNDER 6 Region, Race & Spanish Origin	1979			1984			Absolute Change		Percent Change	
	Total	# Below Poverty	% Below Poverty	Total	# Below Poverty	% Below Poverty	Total	Below Poverty	Total	Below Poverty
United States										
All races	19,197	3,415	17.8	21,082	4,938	23.4	1,885	1,523	9.8	44.6
White	15,691	2,057	13.1	17,159	3,134	18.3	1,468	1,077	9.4	52.4
Black	2,850	1,236	43.4	3,174	1,607	50.6	324	371	11.4	30.0
Spanish Origin	1,966	577	29.3	2,152	869	40.4	186	292*	9.5	50.6
Northeast										
All races	3,616	646	17.9	3,957	949	24.0	341	303	9.4	46.9
White	3,037	446	14.7	3,305	633	19.2	268	187	8.8	41.9
Black	486	195	40.1	551	300	54.4	65	105	13.4	53.8
Spanish Origin	337	155	46.0	372	223	59.9	35	68*	10.4	43.9
Midwest										
All races	5,077	728	14.3	5,441	1,307	24.0	364	579	7.2	79.5
White	4,427	477	10.8	4,474	900	19.0	47	423	1.1	88.7
Black	557	239	42.9	593	376	63.4	36	137	6.5	57.3
Spanish Origin	185	40	21.6	203	76	37.4	18	36*	9.7	90.0
South										
All races	6,503	1,416	21.8	7,189	1,766	24.6	686	350	10.5	24.7
White	4,806	666	13.9	5,320	930	17.5	514	264	10.7	39.6
Black	1,571	724	46.1	1,759	807	45.9	188	83	12.0	11.5
Spanish Origin	559	183	32.7	674	229	34.0	115	46*	20.6	25.1
West										
All races	4,001	625	15.6	4,495	916	20.4	494	291	12.3	46.6
White	3,421	468	13.7	3,787	671	17.7	366	203	10.7	43.4
Black	236	78	33.1	271	124	45.8	35	46	14.8	59.0
Spanish Origin	885	199	22.5	903	341	37.8	18	142*	2.0	71.4

* A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

Source: 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

increase) and 170,000 were children of Spanish origin (41 percent increase).

The rate of increase in poverty was least in the South, 11 percent, although the region continued to have the greatest number and the highest proportion of poor children. In 1984, 4.8 million southern children, 23 percent of all children in the region, lived in families with incomes below the poverty line, up by nearly 1/2 million since 1979. There were 65,000 more black children in poverty (3 percent increase), 390,000 more poor white children (19 percent increase) and 150,000 more poor children of Spanish origin (32.5 percent increase).

While poverty among children increased for all groups in these five years, black children in the South no longer had the highest rate of poverty among children under 18 in 1984 (Table I-3). The poverty rate among children of Spanish origin in the Northeast, 55 percent, was the highest among any group.

The poverty rates for black children in the Midwest and Northeast also grew to exceed those in the South. The poverty rate for black children in the South remained at 44 percent, less than the rate for black children in the Midwest, which increased from 40 percent to 54 percent, and the rate for black children in the Northeast, which climbed from 36 percent to 46 percent.

Poverty Grows Fastest Among Young Children

Over 1.5 million children under six fell into poverty between 1979 and 1984, a 45 percent increase. These "newly poor" young children comprise 30 percent of all impoverished children under six in 1984.

TABLE I-3
Shifts in Child Poverty: 1979-1984

	1979		1984	
	Rank from Highest to Lowest	Percentage In Poverty	Rank from Highest to Lowest	Percentage In Poverty
REGION	1. South	20.3	1. South	22.9
	2. Northeast	15.4	2. Midwest	20.5 1/
	3. West	13.3	2. Northeast	20.5 1/
	4. Midwest	12.6	4. West	18.8
RACE/ETHNIC GROUP	1. Black	40.8	1. Black	46.2
	2. Spanish Origin	27.7	2. Spanish Origin	38.7
	3. White	11.4	3. White	16.1
REGION & RACE/ ETHNIC GROUP	1. South/Black	44.3	1. NE/Spanish Origin	55.0
	2. NE/Spanish Origin	43.4	2. Midwest/Black	54.2
	3. Midwest/Black	40.2	3. NE/Black	45.7
	4. NE/Black	36.0	4. South/Black	44.4
	5. West/Black	30.3	5. Midwest/Spanish Origin	39.0

1/ Regions with equal percentages of children in poverty received equal rank.

Mirroring trends noted earlier for all children under 18, the great majority of newly poor children under six were white children (71 percent), and the poverty rate for this group increased the fastest, from 13 to 18 percent, a 40 percent rise. The poverty rate for children of Spanish origin under six rose by 38 percent, from 29 to 40 percent, while the rate for blacks rose by 17 percent, from 43 to 51 percent.

However, while poverty among black children rose at a comparatively slower rate than for white children and children of Spanish origin, the 1984 poverty rate for young black children, 51 percent, was the highest national rate recorded for any group of young children since the Census Bureau began keeping these statistics in 1970.

Black children under six in the Midwest emerged as the group with the highest rate of poverty for any group of children in 1984 (under six and under 18). Nearly two-thirds of these children (63.4 percent) began their lives in poverty.

POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN IN AMERICA'S COUNTIES

Taking a County-Level Look at Child Poverty

In this study, special attention is focused on those counties with the highest levels of poverty among children. These counties are designated "Child Poverty Counties" and are used throughout the report to indicate where supports for low-income children are most needed.

The most recent county-level poverty data are from the 1980 Decennial Census. (These data actually reflect the poverty status of children during 1979.) Therefore, Child Poverty Counties always refer to the counties with the highest levels of poverty among children in 1979.

Specifically, Child Poverty Counties are those counties which fall into the highest fifth, or highest quintile in terms of poverty rates as determined by the 1980 Decennial Census. The lower cut-off point for this quintile was 25.2 percent, about 1-1/2 times the national poverty rate (16 percent). Table F-4, Appendix F, identifies 1979 child poverty rates for all U.S. counties, including the 622 Child Poverty Counties. Child Poverty Counties are listed separately in Table D-1, Appendix D, and the data are summarized in Table I-4.1/

1/ Child Poverty Counties are defined as those counties that had the highest incidence of children living in families with cash income below official government poverty thresholds. Federal poverty thresholds, however, do not account for variation in the cost-of-living in different localities within the country. Therefore, while in no case could any of the Child Poverty Counties identified here be considered as not in need of substantial support services for low-income children, it could be true that there are other counties in which many families have higher incomes and are not considered officially poor but who do, in fact, have as substantial a need for assistance because of higher costs for goods and services. Unfortunately, the data required to adjust poverty thresholds to reflect varying costs-of-living are not available.

TABLE I-4
Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties

States	Child Poverty Counties	Total No. Counties	Child Poverty Counties as Percentage of Total Counties
UNITED STATES	622	3,115	20%
Alabama	28	67	42%
Alaska	0	1 1/	0%
Arizona	2	14 2/	14%
Arkansas	30	75	40%
California	0	58	0%
Colorado	8	63	13%
Connecticut	0	8	0%
Delaware	0	3	0%
District of Col.	1	1	100%
Florida	24	67	36%
Georgia	73	159	46%
Hawaii	0	5	0%
Idaho	2	44	4%
Illinois	3	102	3%
Indiana	0	92	0%
Iowa	2	99	2%
Kansas	0	105	0%
Kentucky	52	120	43%
Louisiana	30	64	47%
Maine	1	16	6%
Maryland	1	24 3/	4%
Massachusetts	1	14	7%
Michigan	1	83	1%
Minnesota	2	87	2%
Mississippi	58	82	70%

1/ Alaska has no counties or other state geographical sub-units.

2/ One additional county has been created since the Decennial Census was conducted.

3/ Includes one independent city.

TABLE I-4 (continued)
Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties

States	Child Poverty Counties	Total No. Counties	Child Poverty Counties as Percentage of Total Counties
Missouri	19	115 1/	16%
Montana	8	57	14%
Nebraska	10	93	11%
Nevada	1	17 1/	6%
New Hampshire	0	10	0%
New Jersey	2	21	9%
New Mexico	14	32 2/	44%
New York	3	62	5%
North Carolina	28	100	28%
North Dakota	13	53	24%
Ohio	2	88	2%
Oklahoma	17	77	22%
Oregon	0	36	0%
Pennsylvania	1	67	1%
Rhode Island	0	5	0%
South Carolina	21	46	46%
South Dakota	36	66	54%
Tennessee	22	95	23%
Texas	78	254	31%
Utah	1	29	3%
Vermont	0	14	0%
Virginia	17	136 3/	13%
Washington	0	39	0%
West Virginia	10	55	18%
Wisconsin	0	72	0%
Wyoming	0	23	0%

1/ Includes one independent city.

2/ One additional county has been created since the Decennial Census was conducted.

3/ Includes 41 independent cities.

CHAPTER II: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Only five Child Poverty Counties (less than one percent) had high levels of participation across all three programs. No more than 50 of the poorest counties (8 percent) had high participation in two programs (p. 17).

- Only 75 of all U.S. counties (less than 3 percent) had high levels of participation among low-income children in AFDC, Head Start and WIC at the same time. At most, 209 counties (7 percent) had contemporaneous high participation in any two of the programs (p. 14).

- Thirty-one of the poorest counties (5 percent) had low levels of support for impoverished children in all three programs. As many as 56 high poverty counties (9 percent) had low participation in two programs (p. 18).

- The number of counties with low participation in two or more programs was consistently higher than the number of counties with high participation in the same programs. For example, 186 counties (6 percent of all counties) had low participation in all three programs, more than twice the number that had high participation in all three programs. The number of counties with low participation in AFDC and Head Start (335, or 11 percent) was three times the number with high participation in those programs (p. 15).

- States varied enormously in program participation. On a scale averaging program participation across AFDC, WIC and Head Start, the ten top States scored twice as high as the lowest ten States (p. 19).

CHAPTER II: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS

EXTREMELY FEW COUNTIES HAVE HIGH RATES OF PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS, MANY MORE HAVE LOW PARTICIPATION

This section describes the number and geographical distribution of multi-program AFDC, Head Start and WIC High and Low Participation Counties. Counties were designated High Participation Counties in any program if they were among the top fifth (20 percent) of all counties in program participation, measured by comparing the number of children receiving services in the county in March, 1984, or in the case of Head Start, during the 1983-1984 school year, to the most recent estimate of the total number of low-income children in the county. In turn, Low Participation Counties were those counties in the bottom fifth in program participation when the numbers of participants and poor children were compared.1/

75 U.S. Counties Had High Participation in All Programs

Multi-program, High Participation Counties were extremely rare.

Across the Nation, only 75 counties (less than 3 percent of all counties) had high levels of participation in AFDC, Head Start and WIC in 1984 (Table E-1, Appendix E).

The number of counties with high participation rates in two programs was also quite low: 209 Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties (7 percent), 119 AFDC/Head Start High Participation Counties (4 percent), and 207 AFDC/WIC High Participation Counties (7 percent). (Tables E-2 to E-4, Appendix E).

1/ The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion.

Majority of High Participation Counties Found in Midwest

By far, the greatest concentration of multi-program High Participation Counties was in the Midwest, especially in Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan. For example, of the 75 counties that were High Participation Counties in all three programs, 80 percent were in the Midwest, and 53 percent were in the three leading states.

Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan accounted for 48 percent of all counties that had high participation in AFDC and Head Start, and 45 percent of counties that had high participation in AFDC and WIC.

These three states had a substantial percentage of counties high in Head Start and WIC participation as well. The greatest number of counties with high levels of participation in both of these programs, however, were in the South. Mississippi had the most Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties of any state in the Nation.

Low Participation Counties Outnumber High Participation Counties

One hundred eighty six counties (6 percent of all counties) had low levels of participation for low-income children in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC (Table E-5, Appendix E).

In 138 of these three-way low participation counties, or 4 percent of all U.S. counties, AFDC benefits went to a small proportion of all poor children, but either WIC benefits or Head Start benefits were completely lacking.

The number of counties that had low participation in two programs was consistently greater than the number with high participation in two programs.

For example, the 335 AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties (11 percent of all counties) outnumbered AFDC/Head Start High Participation Counties (119) by nearly three-to-one. There were 325 Head Start/WIC Low Participation Counties (10 percent of all counties), over a third more than the 210 Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties. The 253 AFDC/WIC Low Participation Counties (8 percent of all counties) were 18 percent more than 207 AFDC/WIC High Participation Counties. (Tables E-6 - E-8, Appendix E)

Low Participation Counties Widespread

Multi-program Low Participation Counties were spread throughout the South, West, and Midwest. Only two, however, were located in Northeastern states.

Texas, by far, had the highest number of multi-program Low Participation Counties in each of the possible pairings, both within the South and across all states. Compared to any other state, Texas had more than twice as many counties with low participation in two or more programs.

The 64 Texas counties that had low participation in all programs accounted for nearly one-half of all such counties in the Nation.

Montana also consistently had a high number of multi-program Low Participation Counties. Another western state, Idaho, had a significant number of AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties.

In the Midwest, Kansas and Nebraska clearly had the highest numbers of Low Participation Counties across all possible pairings. In addition, North Dakota had numerous AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties, while Indiana had a significant number of Head Start/WIC Low Participation Counties.

COUNTIES WITH THE GREATEST CHILD POVERTY DO NOT HAVE MOST EXTENSIVE SUPPORT PROGRAMS, LOW PARTICIPATION MORE COMMON

The preceding section analyzed the number and distribution of multi-program High and Low Participation Counties among all U.S. counties. This section isolates those multi-program high or low serving counties that also were counties with high overall levels of child poverty -- Child Poverty Counties.

Strong Support Across Programs Lacking in Poorest Counties

In those counties where poverty among children was most extreme, Child Poverty Counties, high levels of program participation in more than one program was virtually nonexistent.

In the entire Nation, only five Child Poverty Counties, less than 1 percent, had high levels of participation across all three programs (Table E-9, Appendix E).

There were also extremely few Child Poverty Counties that had high levels of participation in two programs. Of the Child Poverty Counties, only 50 (8 percent) had high levels of Head Start and WIC participation; 11 (2 percent) had high levels of Head Start and AFDC participation; and 7 (1 percent) had high levels of AFDC and WIC participation (Tables E-10 - E-12, Appendix E).

Clearly, no state had many Child Poverty Counties that were multi-program High Participation Counties. Mississippi had the highest number of such counties. Fifteen of the state's 58 Poverty Counties had high participation in Head Start and WIC.

Low Participation Across All Programs in Six Percent of Poorest Counties

The number of Child Poverty Counties with low levels of service across all three programs was small, although substantially greater than the number of counties with high participation in those programs. There were 31 Child Poverty Counties (5 percent) in which a high percentage of low-income children received few or none of the supports they need through AFDC, Head Start, and WIC (Table E-13, Appendix E).

Fifty-six Child Poverty Counties (9 percent) were also Low Participation Counties in two programs, AFDC and WIC. There were 54 Child Poverty Counties (9 percent) that had low participation in AFDC and Head Start, and 36 Child Poverty Counties (6 percent) were WIC/Head Start Low Participation Counties. (Tables E-14 - E-16, Appendix E)

Child Poverty Counties with low participation in two or more programs were concentrated in five states: Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and especially Texas. For example, of the 31 poor counties with low participation in all there programs, nearly half (14) were in Texas, twice as many as in any other state.

ACROSS ALL PROGRAMS, STATES SHOW ENORMOUS RANGE IN AVERAGE LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION

AFDC, Head Start, and WIC Participation Scales have been developed for each state based on the percentages of High Participation Counties in each state minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties. Each scale provides a relative measure of the degree to which low income children are provided support services in the state. This section compares state's scores on these scales, which can range from -100 to 100.

Wide Gap in Participation Between Top and Bottom States

Participation scores on the AFDC, WIC and Head Start Participation Scales were added together and divided by three to determine an average participation score across programs for each state. States were ranked for overall program participation based on these average scores. (Table II-1)

The average scores for the top ten states were added together and divided by ten to determine an "average of average scores" for these ten states. The value, 39, was twice as high as the average of average scores for the bottom ten states, -36.

Michigan consistently ranked third or fourth in participation in the individual programs, yielding the top overall rank. Two other midwestern states, Wisconsin and Ohio were among the top five states in terms of their average score across all programs. Ohio ranked in the top ten in each support program.

Vermont's average score across programs ranked second, primarily reflecting exceptionally strong WIC participation. Similarly, Mississippi ranked fifth, largely due to very strong Head Start enrollment.

Maryland and the District of Columbia ranked sixth and seventh. Maryland's average score reflected consistency in participation across programs while the District's relatively high average was clearly a function of extremely high AFDC participation.

Three other states had average participation scores in the top ten overall: Connecticut, Rhode Island and California. The two northeastern states' scores reflected relatively high AFDC and WIC scores

TABLE II-1
AFDC, Head Start and WIC Participation Scores by State and Rank

State	AFDC Score	Head Start Score	WIC Score	Average Score	Rank 1/
Michigan	98	32	43	58	1
Vermont	36	14	100	50	2
Wisconsin	89	11	46	49	3
Ohio	90	18	31	46	4
Mississippi	-3	89	29	38	5
Maryland	33	34	38	35	6
Dist. of Col.	100	0	0	33	7
Connecticut	63	0	25	29	8
Rhode Island	60	0	20	27	9
California	89	0	-19	23	10
Illinois	53	-9	20	21	11
New Jersey	81	0	-20	20	12
South Carolina	2	22	37	20	12
Pennsylvania	45	03	4	17	14
New Hampshire	10	0	40	17	14
Missouri	3	20	26	16	16
Maine	38	13	-6	15	17
Minnesota	16	13	11	13	18
Massachusetts	57	-7	-14	12	19
New York	28	-8	10	10	20
Iowa	22	-5	10	9	21
Wyoming	5	-8	30	9	21
Kentucky	1	16	9	9	21
West Virginia	20	2	2	8	24
Hawaii	100	0	-75	8	24
Georgia	-7	-11	26	3	26
Washington	51	-16	-28	2	27
North Carolina	-23	-5	31	1	28
Oklahoma	-22	29	-4	1	28
Delaware	33	0	-33	0	30

1/ States with equal scores received equal rank.

TABLE II-1 (continued)
AFDC, Head Start and WIC Participation Scores by State and Rank

State	AFDC Score	Head Start Score	WIC Score	Average Score	Rank 1/
Alaska	0	0	0	0	30
Arizona	-7	43	-36	0	30
Tennessee	-32	10	12	-3	33
Louisiana	-1	-23	9	-5	34
Alabama	-22	-13	12	-8	35
Nevada	-53	-12	41	-8	36
Florida	-3	-19	-10	-11	37
New Mexico	-22	22	-41	-14	38
Virginia	-6	-44	3	-16	39
Indiana	-8	-31	-15	-18	40
Colorado	-5	-35	-13	-18	40
Arkansas	-49	11	-23	-20	42
Oregon	-3	-36	-31	-23	43
Utah	-41	-41	-14	-32	44
North Dakota	-62	-59	19	-34	45
South Dakota	-64	-11	-28	-34	45
Kansas	-18	-60	-47	-42	47
Nebraska	-43	-49	-35	-42	47
Idaho	-55	-39	-34	-43	49
Texas	-55	-33	-51	-46	50
Montana	-44	-51	-42	-46	50

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

while California reached the top ten almost exclusively because of high AFDC participation.

In contrast to the high scoring states, the two lowest scoring states were Texas and Montana. Montana was in the bottom ten states in AFDC, Head Start and WIC participation, and Texas was among the lowest ten in AFDC and WIC.

Like Montana, the next two lowest ranking states, Idaho and Nebraska were consistently in the bottom ten in each program.

A low average participation score in Kanses largely reflected extremely low participation in Head Start and WIC, while South Dakota's score was due mainly to low AFDC participation. North Dakota's low score reflected very low AFDC and Head Start participation, but relatively high WIC participation.

Two of the other three states in the bottom ten were western states: Utah and Oregon. The final state in the bottom group, Arkansas had above average participation in Head Start but very low AFDC coverage.

Among Regions, Northeast Consistently Highest, West Lowest

Viewing states' AFDC, Head Start, and WIC participation from a regional perspective, it is clear that northeastern states most consistently had high average scores across programs. Led by Vermont, three of nine states in the region were among the top ten states in average participation across programs, and the remaining six were among the top 20.

States in the Midwest showed a distinct split in average participation levels. Three of 11 states in the region were in the top ten and four others were in the top 20. On the other hand, the remaining five ranked fortieth or lower.

Southern states tended to have lower rates of participation relative to other states. While four of 17 states ranked among the top 20, 13 other states were ranked 30th or lower.

Western states consistently had the lowest average program participation scores. While California ranked tenth, 12 of 13 states in the region were ranked below 30, including five states in the bottom ten.

CHAPTER III: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN AFDC (1979-1984)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- The number of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in the over 600 counties with the highest child poverty rates in 1979 -- "Child Poverty Counties " -- declined by 175,000 by 1984, a 10 percent drop (p. 38).

- The number of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits between 1979 and 1984 declined in 30 states despite a nationwide increase of three million more poor children (p. 26).

- The percentage of poor children receiving benefits declined by 22 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 71 percent to 55 percent. Regional declines ranged from nearly a 30 percent drop in the Northeast, to a 16 percent decline in the South (p. 26).

- In 1984, only 27 (4 percent) of all Child Poverty Counties had high levels of AFDC participation, a decrease of more than 50 percent since 1979. In 1979, 57 counties (9 percent) of the poorest counties were also AFDC High Participation Counties (p. 39).

- In 1984, 138 (22 percent) of the poorest counties had low AFDC participation among low-income children, five times the number of Child Poverty Counties with high AFDC participation during that year (p. 42).

- States showed a very wide disparity in program participation between the most and least successful states. The average of the top ten states' scores on an AFDC Participation Scale was over 3-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states' scores (p. 32).

- The value of the average maximum AFDC benefit for a family of four declined by 17 percent between 1979 and 1984, after accounting for inflation. Maximum benefits failed to keep pace with inflation in 49 states, dropping by as much as one-third (p. 46).

CHAPTER III: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN AFDC (1979-1984)

CHILD POVERTY INCREASES BY 3 MILLION SINCE 1979, YET OVER HALF OF ALL STATES SERVE FEWER POOR CHILDREN IN 1984 THAN IN 1979. PERCENTAGE OF POOR CHILDREN SERVED NATIONALLY AND IN ALL REGIONS DECLINES DRAMATICALLY

Between 1979 and 1984, the AFDC program failed to respond to rapidly increasing poverty among children, resulting in a dramatic drop in the percentage of low-income children receiving benefits.[1]

In the U.S., between 1979 and 1984, the rate of AFDC participation for low-income children dropped from 71 percent to 55 percent, a 22 percent decline (Table III-1).

In every region of the country, rates declined substantially because, while the number of children participating in the program essentially remained stable, the number of poor children climbed rapidly. The number of children receiving AFDC increased by less than 25,000, from 7.066 million in February, 1979, to 7.09 million in March, 1984.

While poverty increased among children by 29 percent between 1979-1984, in more than half the states (30), the number of low-income children served by AFDC declined. (Table F-1, Appendix F, shows the change in the number of children served in each U.S. county between 1979 and 1984. The data are summarized by state and region in Table III-2.)

---

[1] In this context, the term "percentage" refers to the ratio of the number of children receiving AFDC benefits during February, 1979 or March, 1984, to the number of related children living in families with annual incomes below the poverty line in 1979 or 1984. The percentages noted are not, in fact, exact because AFDC eligibility is determined on the basis of monthly income, and children enter and leave the program as their family's income fluctuates. As a result, not all children that receive benefits during one month will live in families whose total annual income will be below the poverty line. See Appendix B, p. 91, for further discussion.

TABLE III-1
AFDC Participation Rates for Low-Income Children By Region: 1979 and 1984

	Percentage of Poor Children Receiving AFDC: Feb. 1979	Percentage of Poor Children Receiving AFDC: Mar. 1984	Percent Change
UNITED STATES	71%	55%	-22%
Northeast	96%	68%	-29%
Midwest	89%	64%	-28%
South	45%	38%	-16%
West	85%	62%	-27%

Table III-2
Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by
State and Region: 1979 and 1984

	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Feb. 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Mar. 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
UNITED STATES	7,065,785	7,089,581	23,796	.5%
Northeast	1,937,039	1,703,722	-233,317	-12%
Connecticut	94,216	83,963	-10,253	-11%
Maine	40,306	32,471	-7,835	-19%
Massachusetts	235,834	158,289	-77,545	-33%
New Hampshire	14,164	12,916	-1,248	-9%
New Jersey	319,258	256,585	-62,673	-20%
New York	773,464	734,294	-39,170	-5%
Pennsylvania	412,120	381,567	-30,553	-7%
Rhode Island	34,447	29,497	-4,950	-14%
Vermont	13,230	14,140	910	7%
Midwest	1,862,305	2,094,382	232,077	12%
Illinois	478,867	499,246	20,379	4%
Indiana	105,553	111,513	5,960	6%
Iowa	62,560	71,754	9,194	15%
Kansas	46,521	47,362	841	2%
Michigan	430,765	481,303	50,538	12%
Minnesota	87,780	93,727	5,947	7%
Missouri	132,732	130,718	-2,014	-1%
Nebraska	25,155	29,005	3,850	15%
North Dakota	9,187	7,551	-1,636	-18%
Ohio	330,673	431,623	100,950	30%
South Dakota	14,721	11,350	-3,371	-23%
Wisconsin	137,791	179,230	41,439	30%

Table III-2 (continued)
Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by State and Region: 1979 and 1984

	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Feb. 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Mar. 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
South	1,933,398	1,830,399	-102,999	-5%
Alabama	127,332	107,770	-19,562	-15%
Arkansas	64,348	44,399	-19,949	-31%
Delaware	22,702	16,811	-5,891	-26%
Dist. of Col.	61,645	45,536	-16,109	-26%
Florida	168,115	181,813	13,698	8%
Georgia	150,764	170,928	20,164	13%
Kentucky	116,292	101,513	-14,779	-13%
Louisiana	149,777	154,018	4,241	3%
Maryland	142,242	124,368	-17,874	-13%
Mississippi	128,075	109,722	-18,353	-14%
North Carolina	139,118	113,967	-25,151	-18%
Oklahoma	62,423	57,637	-4,786	-8%
South Carolina	103,198	89,406	-13,792	-13%
Tennessee	114,608	104,677	-9,931	-9%
Texas	212,205	239,143	26,938	13%
Virginia	114,429	105,513	-8,916	-8%
West Virginia	56,125	63,178	7,053	13%
West	1,333,043	1,461,078	128,035	10%
Alaska	9,955	9,037	-918	-9%
Arizona	34,319	51,882	17,563	51%
California	925,608	1,065,254	139,646	15%
Colorado	55,515	52,157	-3,358	-6%
Hawaii	39,442	34,581	-4,861	-12%
Idaho	13,682	12,581	-1,101	-8%
Montana	12,396	13,209	813	7%
Nevada	6,962	8,578	1,616	23%
New Mexico	36,038	31,920	-4,118	-11%
Oregon	76,943	45,938	-31,005	-40%
Utah	26,552	24,500	-2,052	-8%
Washington	91,256	105,455	14,199	16%
Wyoming	4,375	5,986	1,611	37%

Northeast, South Hardest Hit

In both the Northeast and South, both the number and the percentage of low-income children participating in AFDC declined between 1979 and 1984.

The steepest drop in AFDC occurred in the Northeast. Participation dropped from 96 percent in 1979 to 68 percent in 1984, or by 29 percent.

During this period, over 200,000 fewer children received benefits in the Northeast, while the number of poor children increased by nearly one-half million, from 2.0 million to 2.5 million or by 23 percent.

The percentage of children receiving benefits in the South also fell from 45 percent in 1979 to 38 percent in 1984, the lowest in the Nation. Twelve southern states served fewer children in 1984 than in 1979.

During that period, the number of children receiving benefits dropped by over 100,000, while poverty among southern children increased by nearly one-half million, from 4.3 million to 4.8 million, or by 11 percent.

Only one state in the Northeast (Vermont) and five southern states (Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas and West Virginia) provided benefits to a greater number of children in 1984 than in 1979.

More Served in Midwest, West, But Rates of Participation Decline

The rate of increase in the number of children in poverty in both the Midwest (58 percent) and in the West (50 percent) was twice as great as in the Northeast (23 percent) and nearly five times greater than in the South (11 percent).

In response to the enormous growth in poverty in the Midwest and West, the number of children receiving benefits rose moderately, despite various factors restricting growth in AFDC caseloads.[1] But the increase in AFDC participants was not nearly comparable to the increase in poor children, causing therefore a steep decline in poor children's rate of participation in AFDC.

The percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in the Midwest declined by 28 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 89 percent to 64 percent. This occurred despite the fact that over 200,000 more children in the region received benefits and all but three states served more children in 1984 than in 1979.

Over the same period, poverty increased faster in the Midwest than in any other region. The number of low-income children increased by 1.2 million, from 2.1 million in 1979 to 3.3 million in 1984, or by 58 percent.

Similarly in the West, the percentage of low-income children receiving benefits declined by 27 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 85 percent to 62 percent, despite an increase of over 150,000 in the number of children participating in the program. Over the five-year span, 800,000 more children in the West became impoverished.

WIDE VARIATION IN STATE AFDC PARTICIPATION IN 1984. PATTERNS CONSISTENT WITH 1979 TRENDS

The previous section analyzed national and regional trends in AFDC participation (1979-1984). This section compares low income children's AFDC participation between states in 1984, and contrasts these findings with similar data from 1979.

1/ See p. 47 in this chapter for a discussion of state and federal limits on AFDC eligibility.

For the purposes of comparing states, we have developed an AFDC Participation Scale. For each state, the Participation Scale reflects the percentage of AFDC High Participation Counties minus the percentage of AFDC Low Participation Counties.

High Participation Counties are those counties in the top fifth in terms of AFDC participation when the number of children receiving benefits is compared to the estimated total number of low-income children (Table F-2, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-3). Low Participation Counties are those counties in the lowest fifth in terms of AFDC participation (Table F-3, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-4).1/ The range of possible scores on the AFDC Participation Scale for 1979 and 1984 was -100 to 100.

Substantial Split Between Most and Least Successful States

A comparison of AFDC participation scores for the top ten states and those of the lowest ten makes clear the vast disparity between states in the degree that income support was extended to low-income children. The average of the top ten states' scores (83) was over 3-1/2 times greater than the average of the bottom ten states (-50) (Table III-5).

Two states, Hawaii and the District of Columbia 2/, each had the maximum score on the AFDC Participation Scale. These scores were over 5-1/2 times greater than South Dakota's score, the lowest for any state.

1/ The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion.

2/ Throughout this report, the District of Columbia is included in both state- and county-level analyses.

TABLE III-3
Summary by State: 1984 AFDC High Participation Counties
(N = 619)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	0 (0%)	Missouri (115)	15 (13%)
Alaska (1)	0 (0%)	Montana (57)	2 (3%)
Arizona (14)	0 (0%)	Nebraska (93)	7 (7%)
Arkansas (75)	0 (0%)	Nevada (17)	1 (6%)
California (58)	53 (91%)	New Hampshire (10)	1 (10%)
Colorado (63)	11 (17%)	New Jersey (21)	17 (81%)
Connecticut (8)	5 (63%)	New Mexico (32)	0 (0%)
Delaware (3)	1 (33%)	New York (58)	16 (28%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	1 (100%)	North Carolina (100)	1 (1%)
Florida (67)	0 (0%)	North Dakota (53)	1 (2%)
Georgia (159)	3 (2%)	Ohio (88)	80 (91%)
Hawaii (4)	4 (100%)	Oklahoma (77)	0 (0%)
Idaho (44)	2 (4%)	Oregon (36)	3 (8%)
Illinois (102)	54 (53%)	Pennsylvania (67)	31 (46%)
Indiana (92)	5 (5%)	Rhode Island (5)	3 (60%)
Iowa (99)	29 (29%)	South Carolina (46)	3 (6%)
Kansas (105)	16 (15%)	South Dakota (66)	0 (0%)
Kentucky (120)	4 (3%)	Tennessee (95)	0 (0%)
Louisiana (63)	1 (2%)	Texas (253)	0 (0%)
Maine (16)	6 (38%)	Utah (29)	2 (7%)
Maryland (24)	8 (33%)	Vermont (14)	5 (36%)
Massachusetts (14)	8 (57%)	Virginia (131)	11 (8%)
Michigan (83)	81 (98%)	Washington (39)	21 (54%)
Minnesota (83)	24 (29%)	West Virginia (55)	13 (24%)
Mississippi (82)	1 (1%)	Wisconsin (72)	64 (89%)
		Wyoming (23)	5 (22%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-4
Summary by State: 1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties
(N = 620)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties		State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	
Alabama (67)	15	(22%)	Missouri (115)	11	(10%)
Alaska (1)	0	(0%)	Montana (57)	27	(47%)
Arizona (14)	1	(7%)	Nebraska (93)	47	(50%)
Arkansas (75)	37	(49%)	Nevada (17)	10	(59%)
California (58)	1	(2%)	New Hampshire (10)	0	(0%)
Colorado (63)	14	(22%)	New Jersey (21)	0	(0%)
Connecticut (8)	0	(0%)	New Mexico (32)	7	(22%)
Delaware (3)	0	(0%)	New York (58)	0	(0%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0	(0%)	North Carolina (100)	24	(24%)
Florida (67)	2	(3%)	North Dakota (53)	34	(64%)
Georgia (159)	15	(9%)	Ohio (88)	1	(1%)
Hawaii (4)	0	(0%)	Oklahoma (77)	17	(22%)
Idaho (44)	26	(59%)	Oregon (36)	4	(11%)
Illinois (102)	0	(0%)	Pennsylvania (67)	1	(1%)
Indiana (92)	12	(13%)	Rhode Island (5)	0	(0%)
Iowa (99)	7	(7%)	South Carolina (46)	2	(4%)
Kansas (105)	35	(33%)	South Dakota (66)	42	(64%)
Kentucky (120)	2	(2%)	Tennessee (95)	30	(32%)
Louisiana (63)	2	(3%)	Texas (253)	140	(55%)
Maine (16)	0	(0%)	Utah (29)	14	(48%)
Maryland (24)	0	(0%)	Vermont (14)	0	(0%)
Massachusetts (14)	0	(0%)	Virginia (131)	19	(14%)
Michigan (83)	0	(0%)	Washington (39)	1	(3%)
Minnesota (83)	11	(13%)	West Virginia (55)	2	(4%)
Mississippi (82)	3	(4%)	Wisconsin (72)	0	(0%)
			Wyoming (23)	4	(17%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-5
1984 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State

State	Score	Rank 1/	State	Score	Rank 1/
Dist. of Col.	100	1	Kentucky	1	26
Hawaii	100	1	Alaska	0	27
Michigan	98	3	Louisiana	-1	28
Ohio	90	4	Mississippi	-3	29
Wisconsin	89	5	Florida	-3	29
California	89	5	Oregon	-3	29
New Jersey	81	7	Colorado	-5	32
Connecticut	63	8	Virginia	-6	33
Rhode Island	60	9	Arizona	-7	34
Massachusetts	57	10	Georgia	-7	34
Illinois	53	11	Indiana	-8	36
Washington	51	12	Kansas	-18	37
Pennslyvania	45	13	Alabama	-22	38
Maine	38	14	New Mexico	-22	38
Vermont	36	15	Oklahoma	-22	38
Maryland	33	16	North Carolina	-23	41
Delaware	33	16	Tennessee	-32	42
New York	28	18	Utah	-41	43
Iowa	22	19	Nebraska	-43	44
West Virginia	20	20	Montana	-44	45
Minnesota	16	21	Arkansas	-49	46
New Hampshire	10	22	Nevada	-53	47
Wyoming	5	23	Idaho	-55	48
Missouri	3	24	Texas	-55	48
South Carolina	2	25	North Dakota	-62	50
			South Dakota	-64	51

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

The top scores reflect the fact that the District of Columbia, and all of Hawaii's counties in which low-income children resided, were APDC High Participation Counties. In the next highest scoring states, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and California, APDC High Participation Counties comprised about 90 percent or more of all counties, and no more than one county had low participation.

In contrast, all of the ten lowest scoring states had virtually no High Participation Counties, and Low Participation Counties comprised about one-third or more in each.

The four other states among the top ten in APDC participation in 1984 were New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. High scores in each of these northeastern states reflected high levels of participation in more than half of all counties, and the complete absence of Low Participation Counties.

In the five lowest scoring states -- South Dakota, North Dakota, Texas, Idaho, and Nevada -- no more than two counties were High Participation Counties and a majority of counties in each state were Low Participation Counties (nearly two-thirds in North and South Dakota).

Of the remaining states in the bottom ten -- Arkansas, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, and Tennessee -- only Nebraska had more than two APDC High Participation Counties.

APDC Participation Consistent Between 1979-1984

States' APDC participation score and rank in 1979 (Table III-6) compared to 1984 shows a significant degree of consistency over time in the level of support provided to low income children. For example, for

TABLE III-6
1979 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State

State	Score	Rank 1/	State	Score	Rank 1/
Alaska	100	1	Kentucky	6	26
Connecticut	100	1	Virginia	3	27
Dist. of Col.	100	1	Louisiana	1	28
Hawaii	100	1	Minnesota	0	29
Massachusetts	100	1	Alabama	-3	30
Rhode Island	100	1	Colorado	-9	31
Michigan	95	7	Florida	-9	31
New Jersey	90	8	Georgia	-9	31
California	86	9	New Mexico	-9	31
Maine	81	10	Missouri	-11	35
Wisconsin	76	11	Kansas	-12	36
Oregon	72	12	North Carolina	-13	37
Maryland	50	13	Oklahoma	-16	38
Pennsylvania	48	14	Arkansas	-21	39
Washington	46	15	Indiana	-21	39
Vermont	36	16	Tennessee	-25	41
Ohio	35	17	Utah	-28	42
Delaware	33	18	Wyoming	-31	43
New York	32	19	Montana	-41	44
New Hampshire	30	20	Arizona	-43	45
West Virginia	23	21	North Dakota	-43	45
South Carolina	20	22	South Dakota	-45	47
Iowa	16	23	Idaho	-50	48
Illinois	8	24	Texas	-55	49
Mississippi	7	25	Nebraska	-58	50
			Nevada	-59	51

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

both the ten highest and the ten lowest scoring states in 1984, eight were also in the corresponding group in 1979.

However, scores and ranks for a few states changed significantly between 1979 and 1984, largely reflecting a substantial increase or decline in the number of children receiving benefits. Oregon, which experienced a 40 percent decline in the numbers of children served, dropped from twelfth in AFDC participation in 1979 to twenty-ninth in 1984.

In contrast, the number of low-income children receiving benefits in Wyoming rose by 37 percent from 1979 to 1984, raising the state's rank from forty-third to twenty-third.

MILLIONS DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN AFDC. PARTICIPATION DECLINES IN POOREST COUNTIES

This section analyzes the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in all counties during 1979, and the degree to which low-income children in counties with the greatest level of poverty among children -- Child Poverty Counties -- received AFDC benefits in 1979 and 1984.

Number of Children Served Drops in Poorest Counties

In the 622 Child Poverty Counties (counties in the top fifth in terms of child poverty rates in 1979, all 25 percent or more), 1.728 million low-income children received AFDC benefits in 1979. In 1984, despite a severe increase in poverty across the Nation, the number of children receiving benefits declined by 175,000 to 1.553 million, a 10 percent drop. In 24 of the 37 states that contained Child Poverty Counties, the number of children receiving benefits declined.

In 1979, Less than Half of All Poor Children Served in 2000 Counties

In 1979, less than half of all impoverished children participated in AFDC in 2,086 counties, two-thirds of all U.S. counties. In 1,182 counties, AFDC benefits were provided to only one-third or fewer low income children. (See Table F-4, Appendix F, for 1979 AFDC participation rates for all U.S. counties.)

In 1979, the 620 AFDC High Participation Counties (counties in the top fifth in AFDC participation in 1979) served about two-thirds (63 percent) or more of all low-income children in each of those counties (Table F-5, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-7), while the AFDC Low Participation Counties (counties in the lowest fifth in AFDC participation in 1979) served less than one-fourth (24 percent) of all poor children (Table F-6, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-8).

High Participation Child Poverty Counties Decline by 50 Percent in 1984

Counties with the most children in need of income supports, Child Poverty Counties, are not the counties with the highest percentages of participation among low-income children.

In 1984, only 4 percent of all Child Poverty Counties (27) were also AFDC High Participation Counties (Table F-7, Appendix F).

The meager number of Child Poverty/AFDC High Participation Counties in 1984 represents over a 50 percent decline in the number of such counties since 1979. In 1979, 57 counties with the most poverty among children were AFDC High Participation Counties -- counties providing AFDC income assistance to more than about two-thirds of those needy children (Table F-9, Appendix F).

TABLE III-7
Summary by State: 1979 AFDC High Participation Counties
(N = 619)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	4 (6%)	Missouri (115)	10 (9%)
Alaska (1)	1 (100%)	Montana (57)	2 (3%)
Arizona (14)	0 (0%)	Nebraska (93)	4 (4%)
Arkansas (75)	2 (3%)	Nevada (17)	1 (6%)
California (58)	50 (86%)	New Hampshire (10)	3 (30%)
Colorado (63)	10 (16%)	New Jersey (21)	19 (90%)
Connecticut (8)	8 (100%)	New Mexico (32)	0 (0%)
Delaware (3)	1 (33%)	New York (58)	20 (34%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	1 (100%)	North Carolina (100)	7 (7%)
Florida (67)	0 (0%)	North Dakota (53)	2 (4%)
Georgia (159)	4 (2%)	Ohio (88)	32 (36%)
Hawaii (4)	4 (100%)	Oklahoma (77)	1 (1%)
Idaho (44)	1 (2%)	Oregon (36)	28 (78%)
Illinois (102)	23 (22%)	Pennsylvania (67)	32 (48%)
Indiana (92)	8 (9%)	Rhode Island (5)	5 (100%)
Iowa (99)	25 (25%)	South Carolina (46)	11 (24%)
Kansas (105)	16 (15%)	South Dakota (66)	4 (6%)
Kentucky (120)	11 (9%)	Tennessee (95)	1 (1%)
Louisiana (63)	4 (6%)	Texas (253)	1 (1%)
Maine (16)	13 (81%)	Utah (29)	3 (10%)
Maryland (24)	12 (50%)	Vermont (14)	5 (36%)
Massachusetts (14)	14 (100%)	Virginia (131)	20 (15%)
Michigan (83)	79 (95%)	Washington (39)	19 (49%)
Minnesota (83)	20 (24%)	West Virginia (55)	13 (24%)
Mississippi (82)	9 (11%)	Wisconsin (72)	55 (76%)
		Wyoming (23)	1 (4%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-8
Summary by State: 1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties
(N = 620)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	6 (9%)	Missouri (115)	23 (20%)
Alaska (1)	0 (0%)	Montana (57)	25 (44%)
Arizona (14)	6 (43%)	Nebraska (93)	58 (62%)
Arkansas (75)	18 (24%)	Nevada (17)	11 (65%)
California (58)	0 (0%)	New Hampshire (10)	0 (0%)
Colorado (63)	16 (25%)	New Jersey (21)	0 (0%)
Connecticut (8)	0 (0%)	New Mexico (32)	3 (9%)
Delaware (3)	0 (0%)	New York (58)	1 (2%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0 (0%)	North Carolina (100)	20 (20%)
Florida (67)	6 (9%)	North Dakota (53)	25 (47%)
Georgia (159)	17 (11%)	Ohio (88)	1 (1%)
Hawaii (4)	0 (0%)	Oklahoma (77)	13 (17%)
Idaho (44)	23 (52%)	Oregon (36)	2 (6%)
Illinois (102)	14 (14%)	Pennsylvania (67)	0 (0%)
Indiana (92)	28 (30%)	Rhode Island (5)	0 (0%)
Iowa (99)	9 (9%)	South Carolina (46)	2 (4%)
Kansas (105)	28 (27%)	South Dakota (66)	34 (51%)
Kentucky (120)	3 (3%)	Tennessee (95)	25 (26%)
Louisiana (63)	3 (5%)	Texas (253)	142 (56%)
Maine (16)	0 (0%)	Utah (29)	11 (38%)
Maryland (24)	0 (0%)	Vermont (14)	0 (0%)
Massachusetts (14)	0 (0%)	Virginia (131)	16 (12%)
Michigan (83)	0 (0%)	Washington (39)	1 (3%)
Minnesota (83)	20 (24%)	West Virginia (55)	1 (1%)
Mississippi (82)	3 (4%)	Wisconsin (72)	0 (0%)
		Wyoming (23)	8 (35%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

Thus, while relatively high levels of income assistance existed in only 9 percent of the over 600 counties with high concentrations of low-income children in 1979, that percentage was twice as great as in 1984.

As would be expected with such a small number of counties in both 1979 and 1984, no clear geographic patterns were apparent. However, it is worth noting that among the few Child Poverty/High Participation Counties in both years were a number of counties that contain major American cities, including Baltimore, MD; Atlanta, GA; New York, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Richmond, VA; St. Louis, MO; Boston, MA; and Washington, DC.

Low Participation Among Poorest Counties in 1984 and 1979

In 1984, 138 or 22 percent of all Child Poverty Counties were also Low Participation Counties (Table F-8, Appendix F), over five times as many as were Child Poverty/AFDC High Participation Counties.

The rate of low participation among Child Poverty Counties in 1984 was slightly higher than the 1979 rate. In 1979, 129 or 21 percent of the poorest counties were AFDC Low Participation Counties -- counties where no more than about one-fourth of all poor children received benefits (Table F-10, Appendix F).

FAILURE OF AFDC TO MEET INCREASED NEED PARALLELED BY DRAMATIC EROSION IN VALUE OF BENEFITS

A true picture of how well low-income children are served by AFDC must take into account the value of the benefits as well as the number of children who receive assistance.

Even in 1979, the maximum benefits available through AFDC were insufficient in every state to provide a family with enough annual income to lift them out of poverty. Yet, between 1979 and 1984, the real value of those benefits declined in nearly every state.

Benefits Provide No Escape from Poverty in 1979

In 1979, income levels provided through AFDC in every state were far below official estimates of the amount necessary to maintain a minimal standard of living. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, the "lower budget" for a family of four in 1979 was $12,585. In the same year, the poverty threshold, which is not based on the actual price of goods and services, was $7,386 for a family of four.

Differences in states' maximum AFDC payment varied enormously in 1979, yet on an annual basis, all were below the poverty threshold and far below the lower budget. A four-person family with no countable income living in Hawaii, the most generous state, received $546 per month in 1979. This provided a total annual income of $6,552, 89 percent of the poverty level for a four-person family in 1979, and 52 percent of the lower budget.1/

In 1979, a similar family in Mississippi, the least generous state, received a meager $120 per month, for an annual income of $1,440, 19 percent of the poverty level and only 11 percent of the lower budget.

In 1984, Poor Families Fall Deeper into Poverty

Table III-9 shows the change in the inflation-adjusted value of the maximum monthly AFDC payment for a four-person family between 1979 and 1984, and between 1979 and 1986.

1/ Separate poverty thresholds are also calculated for Hawaii and Alaska. In 1979, the poverty threshold for a four-person family in Hawaii was $7,710. The maximum AFDC benefit over 12 months would have provided 85 percent of this amount.

TABLE III-9
Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State:
1979, 1984, and 1986

	July 1979	January 1984	January 1986	Percent Change 79-84 in Constant Dollars	Percent Change 79-86 in Constant Dollars
Alabama	148	147	147	-28%	-34%
Alaska	450	775	823	24%	22%
Arizona	239	282	353	-15%	-1%
Arkansas	188	191	224	-27%	-21%
California	487	625	698	-8%	-4%
Colorado	327	408	420	-10%	-14%
Connecticut	446	549	617	-11%	-8%
Delaware	287	336	349	-15%	-19%
Dist. of Col.	349	366	399	-24%	-24%
Florida	230	273	298	-15%	-14%
Georgia	170	238	264	1%	3%
Hawaii	546	546	546	-28%	-33%
Idaho	367	345	344	-32%	-37%
Illinois 1/	333	368	385	-20%	-23%
Indiana	275	318	316	-17%	-23%
Iowa	419	419	443	-28%	-29%
Kansas 1/	350	411	450	-15%	-14%
Kentucky	235	235	246	-28%	-30%
Louisiana 1/	187	234	234	-10%	-17%
Maine	332	430	489	-7%	-2%
Maryland	294	355	395	-13%	-10%
Massachusetts	379	445	505	-15%	-11%
Michigan 1/ 2/	470	465	536	-29%	-24%
Minnesota	454	583	616	-8%	-9%
Mississippi	120	120	144	-28%	-20%
Missouri	270	305	320	-19%	-21%
Montana	331	425	426	-8%	-14%
Nebraska	370	420	420	-18%	-24%
Nevada	297	272	341	-34%	-23%
New Hampshire	392	389	442	-28%	-25%

1/ Area differentials exist within the State's maximum payment. Figures given represent the largest caseload areas.

2/ Data for Michigan obtained by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

TABLE III-9 (continued)
Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State:
1979, 1984, and 1986

	July 1979	January 1984	January 1986	Percent Change 79-84 in Constant Dollars	Percent Change 79-86 in Constant Dollars
New Jersey	386	414	465	-23%	-20%
New Mexico	242	313	313	-7%	-14%
New York 1/	476	566	596	-14%	-16%
North Carolina	210	221	269	-24%	-16%
North Dakota	389	437	454	-19%	-22%
Ohio	327	343	374	-24%	-24%
Oklahoma	349	349	394	-28%	-25%
Oregon	369	445	482	-13%	-13%
Pennsylvania 1/	373	415	466	-20%	-17%
Rhode Island 2/	389	421	467	-22%	-20%
South Carolina	142	174	239	-12%	12%
South Dakota	361	361	371	-28%	-31%
Tennessee	148	154	186	-25%	-16%
Texas	140	178	221	-8%	5%
Utah	389	416	439	-23%	-25%
Vermont	524	592	651	-19%	-17%
Virginia	284	360	410	-9%	-4%
Washington	483	544	578	-19%	-20%
West Virginia	249	249	312	-28%	-17%
Wisconsin	458	612	649	-4%	-6%
Wyoming	340	355	390	-25%	-23%

1/ Area differentials exist within the State's maximum payment. Figures given represent the largest caseload areas.

2/ Standards are seasonally adjusted. Figures given are for the non-winter period.

Source: 1979 data from AFDC Standards for Basic Needs, July 1979, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1984 and 1986 data from Congressional Research Service surveys.

Despite the already inadequate benefit levels in 1979, in 49 states, the maximum value of AFDC benefits failed to keep pace with inflation between 1979 and 1984.

Between 1979 and 1984, the average maximum benefit for a family of four declined by 17 percent in real terms.

Of the 49 states in which the real value of AFDC maximum benefits declined between 1979 and 1984, the greatest fall occurred in Nevada, where the value of the highest payment dropped by over one-third (34 percent).

In 12 other states, Alabama, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and West Virginia, the maximum benefit declined by 25 percent or more.

The significant erosion in benefit values in five of these 12 states came despite already extremely low maximum benefit values in 1979. In that year, the maximum payment for a four-person family with no income in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, and West Virginia was below $250 per month. In Mississippi, the state with the very lowest maximum payment in 1979, no allowance for inflation in the cost of consumer goods was made, forcing a needy adult and three children to survive in 1984 on the same $120 per month that a similar family received in 1979.

The only states in which the real value of the maximum payment rose between 1979 and 1984 were Alaska (up 24 percent), and Georgia (up 1 percent).

Benefit Erosion through 1986

In 24 states, including the District of Columbia, the value of AFDC benefits either just kept pace with inflation or declined still further between 1984 and 1986. Between 1979 and 1986, maximum benefit levels have declined by 20 percent or more in nearly half (24) of all states.

The decline in the real value of the maximum benefit was greatest in Idaho, followed closely by Alabama, Hawaii, South Dakota, and Iowa.

1979-1984 DECLINE IN PARTICIPATION RATES LINKED TO LOWER REAL PAYMENT STANDARDS AND FEDERAL POLICY CHANGES

The degree to which states' provide AFDC income assistance to low-income children and families is, in part, determined by state "payment standards." The payment standard is the amount of income, varied by family size, used by states to determine AFDC eligibility.1/

1/ To be eligible for AFDC benefits, a family must have "counted income" below the state's need standard. Counted income is the amount of income left after child care, work expenses and other deductions are taken. The need standard is the amount of income the state determines is necessary to meet a minimal standard of living in that state for a family of a specified size.

However, to be eligible for actual AFDC payments, the family's counted income must also be below the State's payment standard. The payment standard is the actual sum from which countable income of an AFDC recepient is deducted to determine the amount, if any, of the AFDC payment for the family.

So, for example, a California family consisting of one adult and three children with no countable income and few assets applying for AFDC assistance in March, 1984, would receive the maximum payment of $660.

If the same family had $300 in earnings, and no allowable child care or work-related deductions, the first $30 plus one-third of the remaining $270 of income ($90) would be excluded, and the remaining $180 would be subtracted from the payment standard ($660 -- equal to the maximum benefit) leaving $480 as the family's AFDC payment for that month.

Under current law, the initial $30 deduction is limited to 12 months, and the one-third deduction is limited to four months. See p. 95, Appendix C, for discussion of other rules and recent amendments affecting AFDC eligibility.

Payment Standards Highly Correlated with Participation Rates

Variation across states in rates of participation is very closely related to significant differences in state AFDC payment standards.

Table III-10 provides the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in each state and payment standards for a four-person family in 1979, as well as the state's rank on these two variables.

States with low payment standards (in effect restricting AFDC participation to families with extremely low incomes) generally had low levels of participation, while states with higher payment standards had higher participation.1/

Just as importantly, because the payment standard is identical to the maximum benefit in most states, participation rates and the maximum payment (for families without income) were also positively correlated. Thus, in states where the lowest percentages of children receive AFDC benefits -- generally in the South -- benefits received by those few who are served are among the most meager.

Eligibility Standards Decline, More Poor Families Are without Assistance

Between 1979 and 1984, the nominal value of the median state payment standard rose from $340 to $379, an increase of $39, or 11 percent (Table III-11).

1/ A test of the strength of the correlation between state's rank on the payment standard and participation variables showed a positive, statistically significant relationship (Spearman's Rho = .38, $p. < .01$). As would be expected, the relationship between state's rank for participation and maximum benefits was also statistically significant (Spearman's Rho = .35, $p. < .01$).

TABLE III-10

Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC Benefits and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children by State: 1979

	AFDC Participation			AFDC Payment Standard	
	Children Receiving AFDC Payments	Percentage of Poor Children Receiving Payments 1/	Rank	Payment Standard for A Four Person Family	Rank
UNITED STATES	7,065,785	71%			
Alabama	127,332	47%	36	$148	49
Alaska	9,955	64%	23	$450	9
Arizona	34,319	27%	50	$239	41
Arkansas	64,348	42%	41	$188	46
California	925,608	98%	11	$487	3
Colorado	55,515	61%	25	$327 2/	30
Connecticut	94,216	102%	7	$446	10
Delaware	22,702	89%	14	$287	35
Dist. of Columbia	61,645	164%	1	$349	24
Florida	168,115	39%	45	$230	43
Georgia	150,764	44%	39	$170	48
Hawaii	39,442	112%	5	$546	1
Idaho	13,682	32%	49	$367	21
Illinois	478,867	100%	8	$333	27
Indiana	105,553	56%	27	$327	30
Iowa	62,560	67%	21	$419	11
Kansas	46,521	64%	24	$350	23
Kentucky	116,292	51%	32	$235	42
Louisiana	149,777	49%	33	$187	47
Maine	40,306	81%	17	$332	28
Maryland	142,242	99%	9	$294	34
Massachusetts	235,834	122%	2	$379	17
Michigan	430,765	119%	3	$470	6
Minnesota	87,780	74%	18	$454	8
Mississippi	128,075	52%	30	$252	38

1/ Percentages above 100% in some states reflect differences in reporting periods for poverty and AFDC participation data. See Appendix B, p. 91, for discussion.

2/ Payment standard for April-October. Payment standard for November-March was $347.

TABLE III-10 (continued)
Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC Benefits and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children by State: 1979

	AFDC Participation			AFDC Payment Standard	
	Children Receiving AFDC Payments	Percentage of Poor Children Receiving Payments 1/	Rank	Payment Standard for A Four Person Family	Rank
Missouri	132,732	68%	20	$270	37
Montana	12,396	39%	44	$331	29
Nebraska	25,155	48%	34	$370	19
Nevada	6,962	34%	48	$297	33
New Hampshire	14,164	59%	26	$392	12
New Jersey	319,258	115%	4	$386	16
New Mexico	36,038	40%	42	$242	40
New York	773,464	88%	15	$476	5
North Carolina	139,118	47%	38	$210	45
North Dakota	9,187	34%	47	$389	13
Ohio	330,673	82%	16	$327	30
Oklahoma	62,423	47%	35	$349	24
Oregon	76,943	91%	13	$369	20
Pennsylvania	412,120	97%	12	$373	18
Rhode Island	34,447	106%	6	$389 2/	13
South Carolina	103,198	53%	29	$229	44
South Dakota	14,721	36%	46	$361	22
Tennessee	114,608	43%	40	$148	49
Texas	212,205	27%	51	$140	51
Utah	26,552	47%	37	$389	13
Vermont	13,230	66%	22	$524	2
Virginia	114,429	51%	31	$284	36
Washington	91,256	71%	19	$483	4
West Virginia	56,125	55%	28	$249	39
Wisconsin	137,791	99%	10	$458	7
Wyoming	4,375	40%	43	$340	26

1/ Percentages above 100% in some states reflect differences in reporting periods for poverty and AFDC participation data. See Appendix B, p. 91, for discussion.

2/ Payment standard for April-November. Payment standard for November-March was $518.

TABLE III-11
AFDC Need Standard and Payment Standard
for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985

State	July, 1979 Need Standard	July, 1979 Payment Standard	July, 1984 Need Standard	July, 1984 Payment Standard	July, 1985 Need Standard	July, 1985 Payment Standard
Alabama	$240	$148	$480	$147	$480	$147
Alaska	450	450	775	775	800	800
Arizona	282	239	282	282	282	282
Arkansas	273	188	273	191	273	224
California	511	487	660	660	698	698
Colorado	327	327	510	510	664	664
Connecticut	446	446	636	636	664	664
Delaware	287	287	336	336	336	336
Dist. of Col.	481	349	715	366	798	399
Florida	230	230	468	273	268	284
Georgia	227	170	432	295	432	264
Hawaii	546	546	546	546	546	546
Idaho	421	367	627	344	627	344
Illinois	333	333	713	368	742	385
Indiana	363	327	363	326	363	326
Iowa	419	419	578	419	578	419
Kansas	350	350	422	422	446	446
Kentucky	235	235	246	246	246	246
Louisiana	495	187	661	234	712	234
Maine	349	332	623	452	641	641
Maryland	314	294	520	376	546	395
Massachusetts	480	379	735	463	515	515
Michigan 1/	470	470	598	465	658	512
Minnesota	454	454	611	611	616	616
Mississippi	252	252	327	327	327	327

1/ Data for Michigan obtained by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

TABLE III-11 (continued)
AFDC Need Standard and Payment Standard
for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985

State	July, 1979		July, 1984		July, 1985	
	Need Standard	Payment Standard	Need Standard	Payment Standard	Need Standard	Payment Standard
Missouri	365	270	365	308	365	320
Montana	331	331	513	425	514	426
Nebraska	370	370	420	420	420	420
Nevada	341	297	341	272	341	341
New Hampshire	392	392	429	429	442	442
New Jersey	386	386	443	443	465	465
New Mexico	242	242	313	313	313	313
New York	476	476	566	566	566	566
North Carolina	210	210	442	221	538	269
North Dakota	389	389	437	437	454	454
Ohio	431	327	757	343	809	360
Oklahoma	349	349	349	349	583	349
Oregon	462	369	446	446	468	468
Pennsylvania	373	373	675	415	749	444
Rhode Island	389	389	440	440	467	467
South Carolina	229	229	229	229	229	229
South Dakota	361	361	371	371	371	371
Tennessee	217	148	300	168	413	186
Texas	187	140	593	178	593	201
Utah	519	389	802	802	809	809
Vermont	656	524	951	622	985	651
Virginia	315	284	422	379	457	410
Washington	483	483	904	561	914	561
West Virginia	332	249	332	249	623	312
Wisconsin	520	458	749	636	749	636
Wyoming	340	340	310	310	390	390
Median State		340		379		399

Source: 1979 data from AFDC Standards for Basic Needs, July 1979, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1984 and 1985 data from Congressional Research Service surveys.

However, after accounting for inflation, this change represents a 23 percent decline in the median state payment standard.

As a result, although the numbers of families falling into poverty increased, and more and more families with already marginal incomes fell below inflation-adjusted poverty thresholds, hundreds of thousands of families found that their inadequate incomes remained above AFDC payment eligibility standards. These families faced poverty, many perhaps for the first time, with no recourse to income assistance through AFDC.1/

Working Poor Families Abandoned by AFDC

At the same time that state eligibility standards were narrowing in the face of rising poverty, federal AFDC policies concerning eligibility and benefits also changed, affecting hundreds of thousands of families and children.

1/ In addition to AFDC, nearly all states and the District of Columbia operate General Assistance (GA) programs. GA is a generic term used to comprise all state and local programs of continuing or emergency income assistance. These programs are legislated, designed and funded at the state and local level. No federal funds are provided for GA.

GA programs serve as the ultimate "safety net" for low-income individuals and families who are not eligible for AFDC or other federally-supported assistance programs. Beyond the common generic term and the state and local control, however, GA programs have few common characteristics. Eligibililty criteria vary from strict disability requirements to broad income requirements with no categorical restrictions. Benefit levels vary from small one-time payments to regular payments virtually identical to AFDC.

As of late 1982, 25 jurisdictions, including Washington, D.C., operated statewide GA programs, fully funded by the state. Nineteen states provided no funds for local relief programs, although four of these states required their localities to offer GA. One state, West Virginia, had no cash GA program, having ended state funding for it in 1980. The remaining nine states generally shared GA costs with localities.

According to the U.S. General Accounting Office, 442,000 fewer AFDC cases were opened after 1981 than would have been expected to be opened because of restrictions imposed on AFDC eligibility under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA).[1/]

The number of children affected was not reported. However, given that the average number of children in AFDC families was two in 1984, it can be estimated that nearly 900,000 low-income children were denied benefits because of OBRA changes.

Of the 22 provisions in OBRA which affected the AFDC program, GAO identified six that had the most effect on program participation:

-- A limitation on gross income to 150 percent of the state "need standard" (the amount of income determined by the state as necessary to meet a minimal standard of living);

-- The imposition of a 4-month limit on an existing provision in which the first $30 of earned-income and one-third of the remainder were disregarded in the calculation of AFDC benefits;

-- The placement of a $75 ceiling on work-expense deductions for full-time employment;

-- The placement of a $160 ceiling on the child-care expense deduction for each child;

-- The inclusion of the income of stepparents; and

-- The limitation of assets to $1,000.

[1/] In An Evaluation of the 1981 AFDC Changes: Final Report, published July 2, 1985, the GAO reported that OBRA changes affected working AFDC recipients disproportionately. For example, among the five sites studied, 39-60 percent of AFDC earner cases (that is, cases that included workers) were closed and an additional 8-48 percent of earner cases had their grants reduced. The comparable figures for non-earner cases were 1-12 percent closed and an additional 1-6 percent were reduced.

See Appendix C, p. 96, for discussion of OBRA and more recent amendments affecting AFDC eligibility and payment levels.

CHAPTER IV: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN HEAD START

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- In 1984, 15 percent of all low-income children ages 3 to 5 were enrolled in Head Start, down by 25 percent from the percentage of impoverished children served in 1979. In 1979, 20 percent were enrolled (p. 56).

- In 1984, 862 counties, 28 percent of all U.S. counties had no Head Start program (p. 56).

- In one-fourth of all the Child Poverty Counties, no Head Start program existed in 1984 (p. 63).

- One hundred ninety-one (31 percent) of all Child Poverty Counties had high Head Start participation in 1984 (p. 63).

- Wide disparities in Head Start participation existed between states. The average of the top ten states' scores on a Head Start Participation Scale was nearly 2-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states' scores (p. 58).

CHAPTER IV: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN HEAD START

This section provides data on the total number and percentage of low-income children enrolled in Head Start in the U.S. in 1984, and on the number of counties where no children were enrolled.

NATIONALLY, PERCENTAGE OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN SERVED BY HEAD START FALLS BY 25 PERCENT SINCE 1979. IN OVER 850 COUNTIES, NO CHILDREN WERE ENROLLED IN 1984.

During the 1983-1984 school year (September, 1983 - August, 1984), 395,439 children were enrolled in Head Start in the United States (Table IV-1).1/ This figure represents only 15 percent of the 2,553,000 three, four, and five year old children living in families with incomes below the poverty level in 1984.

The low level of participation in 1984 reflects a 25 percent decline in the percentage of low-income children served since 1979. In the 1978-1979 school year (September, 1978 - August, 1979), 322,723 children were enrolled in Head Start, 20 percent of all low-income children ages 3-5 in 1979.1/

The extremely low national rate of Head Start participation in 1984 reflected the fact that in 862 counties, 28 percent of all U.S. counties, no Head Start program existed.2/

1/ Figures include up to 10 percent non-poor children. Figures exclude children enrolled in Head Start in Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands and other U.S. territories, or in programs that ran only during the summer.

2/ In FY 1985, 153 Head Start programs were begun in counties where no program existed previously. These counties are noted in Appendix G, Table G-2.

TABLE IV-1
Summary by State: Children Participating in Head Start

State	Children Enrolled in Head Start 1984	State	Children Enrolled in Head Start 1984
United States	395,439		
Alabama	9,908	Missouri	7,904
Alaska	1,131	Montana	2,068
Arizona	8,632	Nebraska	1,868
Arkansas	5,628	Nevada	651
California	32,339	New Hampshire	670
Colorado	5,365	New Jersey	9,510
Connecticut	4,189	New Mexico	5,187
Delaware	899	New York	24,393
Dist. of Col.	1,705	North Carolina	10,740
Florida	13,082	North Dakota	1,273
Georgia	9,717	Ohio	20,214
Hawaii	1,257	Oklahoma	7,977
Idaho	1,589	Oregon	3,330
Illinois	23,019	Pennsylvania	15,128
Indiana	6,832	Rhode Island	1,409
Iowa	3,025	South Carolina	6,238
Kansas	2,715	South Dakota	1,541
Kentucky	10,288	Tennessee	8,375
Louisiana	9,279	Texas	23,889
Maine	1,584	Utah	2,271
Maryland	5,093	Vermont	899
Massachusetts	7,761	Virginia	5,191
Michigan	20,248	Washington	5,072
Minnesota	5,244	West Virginia	3,677
Mississippi	28,180	Wisconsin	6,479
		Wyoming	776

Source: Head Start Funding Guidance Records, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

STATES SHOW WIDE DIFFERENCES IN OVERALL HEAD START PARTICIPATION

This section compares participation across states using a Head Start Participation Scale. The Participation Scale reflects the percentage of Head Start High Participation Counties minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties in each state. High Participation Counties are the top quintile of all counties when the number of children enrolled is compared to the number of low-income children ages 3-5 in the county (Table G-1, Appendix G, summarized in Table IV-2). Low Participation Counties are the lowest quintile of all counties (Table G-2, Appendix G, summarized in Table IV-3).1/

Similar to AFDC participation in 1984, the disparity in levels of participation between scores of the highest and lowest ten states was very substantial. The average of the top ten states' scores, 32.5, was nearly 2-1/2 times as high as the average for the lowest ten states, -45. Mississippi's score, highest of all states, was nearly five times greater than Kansas' score, lowest of all states (Table IV-4).

In Mississippi, 73 of the state's 82 counties (89 percent) were Head Start High Participation Counties and no counties were Head Start Low Participation Counties.

1/ The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion. In the case of Head Start Low Participation Counties, however, all counties served no children in 1984. Because of the high number of counties that had no Head Start program (862) the lowest quintile extends to 28 percent of all counties rather than the lowest 20 percent.

TABLE IV-2
Summary by State: 1984 Head Start High Participation Counties
(N = 622)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties		State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	
Alabama (67)	12	(18%)	Missouri (115)	27	(23%)
Alaska (1)	0	(0%)	Montana (57)	10	(17%)
Arizona (14)	6	(43%)	Nebraska (93)	12	(13%)
Arkansas (75)	20	(27%)	Nevada (17)	5	(29%)
California (58)	7	(12%)	New Hampshire (10)	0	(0%)
Colorado (63)	15	(24%)	New Jersey (21)	0	(0%)
Connecticut (8)	0	(0%)	New Mexico (32)	16	(50%)
Delaware (3)	0	(0%)	New York (62)	4	(6%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0	(0%)	North Carolina (100)	17	(17%)
Florida (67)	6	(9%)	North Dakota (53)	4	(7%)
Georgia (159)	34	(21%)	Ohio (88)	18	(20%)
Hawaii (4)	0	(0%)	Oklahoma (77)	37	(48%)
Idaho (44)	4	(9%)	Oregon (36)	2	(6%)
Illinois (102)	12	(12%)	Pennsylvania (67)	6	(9%)
Indiana (92)	10	(11%)	Rhode Island (5)	0	(0%)
Iowa (99)	7	(7%)	South Carolina (46)	10	(22%)
Kansas (105)	10	(9%)	South Dakota (66)	12	(18%)
Kentucky (120)	36	(30%)	Tennessee (95)	22	(23%)
Louisiana (64)	11	(17%)	Texas (253)	41	(16%)
Maine (16)	2	(13%)	Utah (29)	4	(14%)
Maryland (24)	9	(38%)	Vermont (14)	3	(21%)
Massachusetts (14)	0	(0%)	Virginia (136)	18	(13%)
Michigan (83)	27	(32%)	Washington (39)	4	(10%)
Minnesota (87)	17	(19%)	West Virginia (55)	7	(13%)
Mississippi (82)	73	(89%)	Wisconsin (72)	17	(24%)
			Wyoming (23)	8	(35%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE IV-3
Summary by State: 1984 Head Start Low Participation Counties
(N = 862)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	21 (31%)	Missouri (115)	3 (3%)
Alaska (1)	0 (0%)	Montana (57)	39 (68%)
Arizona (14)	0 (0%)	Nebraska (93)	58 (62%)
Arkansas (75)	12 (16%)	Nevada (17)	7 (41%)
California (58)	7 (12%)	New Hampshire (10)	0 (0%)
Colorado (63)	37 (59%)	New Jersey (21)	0 (0%)
Connecticut (8)	0 (0%)	New Mexico (32)	9 (28%)
Delaware (3)	0 (0%)	New York (62)	9 (14%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0 (0%)	North Carolina (100)	22 (22%)
Florida (67)	19 (28%)	North Dakota (53)	35 (66%)
Georgia (159)	51 (32%)	Ohio (88)	2 (2%)
Hawaii (4)	0 (0%)	Oklahoma (77)	15 (19%)
Idaho (44)	21 (48%)	Oregon (36)	15 (42%)
Illinois (102)	21 (21%)	Pennsylvania (67)	4 (6%)
Indiana (92)	39 (42%)	Rhode Island (5)	0 (0%)
Iowa (99)	12 (12%)	South Carolina (46)	0 (0%)
Kansas (105)	72 (69%)	South Dakota (66)	19 (29%)
Kentucky (120)	17 (14%)	Tennessee (95)	12 (13%)
Louisiana (64)	25 (40%)	Texas (253)	123 (49%)
Maine (16)	0 (0%)	Utah (29)	16 (55%)
Maryland (24)	1 (4%)	Vermont (14)	1 (7%)
Massachusetts (14)	1 (7%)	Virginia (136)	77 (57%)
Michigan (83)	0 (0%)	Washington (39)	10 (26%)
Minnesota (87)	5 (6%)	West Virginia (55)	6 (11%)
Mississippi (82)	0 (0%)	Wisconsin (72)	9 (13%)
		Wyoming (23)	10 (43%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE IV-4
1984 Head Start Participation Scores and Rank by State

State	Score	Rank 1/
Mississippi	89	1
Arizona	43	2
Maryland	34	3
Michigan	32	4
Oklahoma	29	5
South Carolina	22	6
New Mexico	22	6
Missouri	20	8
Ohio	18	9
Kentucky	16	10
Vermont	14	11
Maine	13	12
Minnesota	13	12
Wisconsin	11	14
Arkansas	11	14
Tennessee	10	16
Pennsylvania	3	17
West Virginia	2	18
New Hampshire	0	19
New Jersey	0	19
Connecticut	0	19
Delaware	0	19
Dist. of Col.	0	19
Alaska	0	19
California	0	19
Hawaii	0	19
Rhode Island	0	19
Iowa	-5	28
North Carolina	-5	28
Massachusetts	-7	30
New York	-8	31
Wyoming	-8	31
Illinois	-9	33
South Dakota	-11	34
Georgia	-11	34
Nevada	-12	36
Alabama	-13	37
Washington	-16	38
Florida	-19	39
Louisiana	-23	40
Indiana	-31	41
Texas	-33	42
Colorado	-35	43
Oregon	-36	44
Idaho	-39	45
Utah	-41	46
Virginia	-44	47
Nebraska	-49	48
Montana	-51	49
North Dakota	-59	50
Kansas	-60	51

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

In contrast, nearly all other states that achieved the top Head Start Participation Scores had relatively few counties with high levels of support. Among the next six highest scoring states (Arizona, Maryland, Michigan, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and New Mexico), only New Mexico had a majority of High Participation Counties.

Very low Head Start Participation scores in two midwestern states (Kansas and North Dakota) reflected the fact that at least two-thirds of the counties in each of these states had no Head Start program in 1984. In both states, Head Start High Participation Counties comprised less than 10 percent of all counties.

In another five of the lowest scoring states (Montana, Nebraska, Virginia, Utah, and Colorado) well over half of all counties had no Head Start program in 1984. (Nearly 60 percent of Colorado's counties had no Head Start program although nearly one-fourth of the state's counties had high levels of Head Start enrollment.)

Overall, half of the lowest ten states were western states, reflecting the generally low level of Head Start participation in the region.

HIGH HEAD START PARTICIPATION IN LESS THAN THIRTY PERCENT OF THE POOREST COUNTIES, WHILE ONE-FOURTH HAVE NO HEAD START AT ALL

This section describes the relationship between poverty and children's participation in Head Start at the county level. Those counties that were both Child Poverty Counties -- counties with poverty rates above 25 percent in 1979 -- and Head Start High Participation Counties are described first, followed by counties that were both Child Poverty Counties and Head Start Low Participation Counties.

High Enrollment Lacking in Most Poor Counties

Counties with the highest rates of poverty were generally not those with the highest levels of Head Start participation. Across the Nation, only 191 Child Poverty Counties (31 percent) were also Head Start High Participation Counties (Table G-3, Appendix G).

Thus, Head Start enrollment was relatively strong in less than one-third of the counties where poverty among children was most concentrated. In this respect, Head Start participation closely paralleled AFDC participation for low-income children: support services were not concentrated in those areas with the greatest level of need.

However, there were some notable exceptions to this trend. In Mississippi, the state with the highest concentration of poor children, 90 percent of the state's Child Poverty Counties were Head Start High Participation Counties as well.

Several other states had significant numbers of Child Poverty Counties that were also High Participation Counties. These included Missouri (8 of 19, or 42 percent), New Mexico (8 of 14, or 57 percent), Oklahoma (14 of 17, or 82 percent) and West Virginia (4 of 10, or 40 percent). The two Arizona Child Poverty Counties, and the one Michigan Child Poverty County were also High Participation Counties.

Zero Participation in One-Quarter of the Poorest Counties

In 1984, in 154, or 25 percent, of the U.S. counties with the most child poverty, no Head Start program was in existance (Table G-4, Appendix G).

Nineteen states had at least one Child Poverty/Head Start Low Participation County. In four states, over half of all Child Poverty Counties had zero Head Start participation rates, led by Montana, where 6 of 8 Child Poverty Counties (75 percent) were also Head Start Low Participation Counties. The other three states were Virginia (12 of 17, or 70 percent), North Dakota (8 of 13, or 61 percent), and Nebraska (6 of 10, or 60 percent).

In Louisiana, nearly a majority of all Child Poverty Counties were Head Start Low Participation Counties (14 of 30, or 47 percent).

CHAPTER V: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN WIC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- In 1984, one-third of all low-income children under 5 received WIC benefits, up by 22 percent from the percentage of poor children served in 1979. In 1979, 27 percent were served (p. 66).

- In 1984, 332 counties, 11 percent of all U.S. counties had no WIC program (p. 66).

- Only 95 (15 percent) of all the Child Poverty Counties had high WIC participation in 1984 (p. 74).

- Seventeen percent of all Child Poverty Counties (103) were WIC Low Participation Counties. Of these, 40 of the poorest counties (6 percent) had no WIC program (p. 74).

- As in AFDC and Head Start, wide gaps in overall program participation existed among states. The average of the top ten states' scores on a WIC Participation Scale was 2-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states (p. 68).

CHAPTER V: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN WIC

This section provides data on the total number and average monthly percentage of low-income children receiving WIC benefits in 1984, and on the number of counties where no children received benefits.

WIC BENEFITS REACHED JUST ONE-THIRD OF ALL POOR CHILDREN, OVER TEN PERCENT OF ALL COUNTIES SERVED NO CHILDREN

An estimated 1,425,725 poor infants and children participated in the WIC program in the U.S. in March, 1984 1/ (Table V-1). This figure is one-third of the 4,280,000 children under five living in families with incomes below the poverty level in 1984.

Like the Head Start program, the fact that only one-third of all poor children received WIC benefits in 1984 reflects the significant number of counties in which no WIC program existed. Across 19 states, 332 counties or 11 percent of all U.S. counties, had no WIC program for young, low-income children.2/ These 332 counties represent over half of all 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties.

While the percentage of low-income children receiving WIC was quite low in 1984, it represented a 22 percent increase in participation

---

1/ WIC income eligiblity limits extend to 185 percent of the poverty threshold in most states. The procedure employed to estimate the number of children receiving WIC benefits who fell at or below the poverty line is described in Appendix A, p. 83.

2/ As of September, 1986, WIC programs had been instituted in 196 counties in which no children were served in March, 1984. These counties are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.

In addition, some counties receive a similar program, the Community Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), which provides supplemental food to women, infants and children not participating in the WIC program. The CSFP provides federally-purchased commodities to states which, in turn, distribute these commodities to low-income pregnant, postpartum, and nursing mothers, and infants and children up to age six who are vulnerable to malnutrition. No person may participate in both CSFP and the WIC program at the same time. Counties in which CSFP clinics were in operation during 1984 are noted in Appendix I, Table I-1.

TABLE V-1
Summary by State: Children Participating in WIC

State	Estimated Number of Poor Children Receiving WIC Benefits March, 1984	State	Estimated Number of Poor Children Receiving WIC Benefits March, 1984
United States	1,425,725		
Alabama	37,709	Missouri	32,262
Alaska	1,828	Montana	4,159
Arizona	10,839	Nebraska	7,723
Arkansas	15,065	Nevada	5,003
California	79,017	New Hampshire	5,749
Colorado	13,632	New Jersey	29,216
Connecticut	21,629	New Mexico	6,234
Delaware	3,459	New York	121,577
Dist. of Col.	5,764	North Carolina	49,198
Florida	43,449	North Dakota	6,662
Georgia	53,475	Ohio	89,406
Hawaii	2,405	Oklahoma	18,184
Idaho	5,616	Oregon	11,603
Illinois	67,191	Pennsylvania	60,878
Indiana	27,319	Rhode Island	6,650
Iowa	19,708	South Carolina	36,488
Kansas	11,958	South Dakota	5,222
Kentucky	31,288	Tennessee	28,798
Louisiana	41,246	Texas	91,346
Maine	7,801	Utah	10,468
Maryland	28,935	Vermont	7,800
Massachusetts	23,805	Virginia	28,480
Michigan	66,560	Washington	15,421
Minnesota	30,527	West Virginia	14,990
Mississippi	45,663	Wisconsin	33,203
		Wyoming	3,114

Source: Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families Survey.

since 1979. In fiscal year 1979, the average monthly number of low-income infants and children participating in the WIC program was estimated to be 764,000, 27 percent of all poor children under five years old.

BEST AND WORST STATES FAR APART IN WIC SUPPORT

This section describes variation in WIC support across states, based on states' scores on a WIC Participation Scale.

The Participation Scale reflects the percentage of WIC High Participation Counties minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties. WIC High Participation Counties are the top fifth of all counties when the number of children served is compared to the number of low-income children aged 0-4 in the county. (Table H-1, Appendix H, summarized in Table V-2). WIC Low Participation Counties are the lowest fifth of all counties (Table H-2, Appendix H, summarized in Table V-3).1/

WIC Participation Exceptional in Vermont, Strong in Northeast

As with state participation in AFDC and Head Start, the most and least successful states in providing nutritional benefits through WIC had widely divergent scores on the WIC Participation Scale. Similar to Head Start, the average of the top ten states' scores was two and one-half times as high as the average of the lowest ten states.

Vermont, in which all 14 counties were WIC High Participation Counties, had the highest rating of any state on the WIC Participation

---

1/ The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data. However, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 88, for further discussion.

TABLE V-2
Summary by State: 1984 WIC High Participation Counties
(N = 622)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	10 (15%)	Missouri (115)	31 (27%)
Alaska (1)	0 (0%)	Montana (57)	3 (5%)
Arizona (14)	0 (0%)	Nebraska (93)	8 (9%)
Arkansas (75)	0 (0%)	Nevada (17)	9 (53%)
California (58)	7 (12%)	New Hampshire (10)	4 (40%)
Colorado (63)	14 (22%)	New Jersey (21)	2 (9%)
Connecticut (8)	2 (25%)	New Mexico (32)	1 (3%)
Delaware (3)	0 (0%)	New York (58)	8 (13%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0 (0%)	North Carolina (100)	31 (31%)
Florida (67)	6 (9%)	North Dakota (53)	18 (34%)
Georgia (159)	43 (27%)	Ohio (88)	30 (34%)
Hawaii (4)	0 (0%)	Oklahoma (77)	13 (17%)
Idaho (44)	3 (7%)	Oregon (36)	0 (0%)
Illinois (102)	28 (27%)	Pennsylvania (67)	11 (16%)
Indiana (92)	18 (20%)	Rhode Island (5)	1 (20%)
Iowa (99)	14 (14%)	South Carolina (46)	17 (37%)
Kansas (105)	14 (13%)	South Dakota (66)	3 (4%)
Kentucky (120)	21 (18%)	Tennessee (95)	14 (15%)
Louisiana (64)	11 (17%)	Texas (253)	26 (10%)
Maine (16)	0 (0%)	Utah (29)	2 (7%)
Maryland (24)	9 (38%)	Vermont (14)	14 (100%)
Massachusetts (14)	0 (0%)	Virginia (136)	35 (26%)
Michigan (83)	39 (47%)	Washington (39)	3 (8%)
Minnesota (87)	23 (26%)	West Virginia (55)	7 (13%)
Mississippi (82)	25 (30%)	Wisconsin (72)	34 (47%)
		Wyoming (23)	10 (43%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE V-3
Summary by State: 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties
(N = 621)

State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties	State and Total No. of Counties 1/	Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties
Alabama (67)	2 (3%)	Missouri (115)	1 (1%)
Alaska (1)	0 (0%)	Montana (57)	27 (47%)
Arizona (14)	5 (36%)	Nebraska (93)	41 (44%)
Arkansas (75)	17 (23%)	Nevada (17)	2 (12%)
California (58)	18 (31%)	New Hampshire (10)	0 (0%)
Colorado (63)	22 (35%)	New Jersey (21)	6 (29%)
Connecticut (8)	0 (0%)	New Mexico (32)	14 (44%)
Delaware (3)	1 (33%)	New York (58)	2 (3%)
Dist. of Col. (1)	0 (0%)	North Carolina (100)	0 (0%)
Florida (67)	13 (19%)	North Dakota (53)	8 (15%)
Georgia (159)	1 (1%)	Ohio (88)	3 (3%)
Hawaii (4)	3 (75%)	Oklahoma (77)	16 (21%)
Idaho (44)	18 (41%)	Oregon (36)	11 (31%)
Illinois (102)	7 (7%)	Pennsylvania (67)	8 (12%)
Indiana (92)	32 (35%)	Rhode Island (5)	0 (0%)
Iowa (99)	4 (4%)	South Carolina (46)	0 (0%)
Kansas (105)	63 (60%)	South Dakota (66)	21 (32%)
Kentucky (120)	11 (9%)	Tennessee (95)	3 (3%)
Louisiana (64)	5 (8%)	Texas (253)	155 (61%)
Maine (16)	1 (6%)	Utah (29)	6 (21%)
Maryland (24)	0 (0%)	Vermont (14)	0 (0%)
Massachusetts (14)	2 (14%)	Virginia (136)	31 (23%)
Michigan (83)	3 (4%)	Washington (39)	14 (36%)
Minnesota (87)	13 (15%)	West Virginia (55)	6 (11%)
Mississippi (82)	1 (1%)	Wisconsin (72)	1 (1%)
		Wyoming (23)	3 (13%)

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

Scale (Table V-4). This score was eight times higher than the lowest scoring state, Hawaii. Three of Hawaii's four counties in which low-income children resided were Low Participation Counties.

WIC participation at the state level also resembled Head Start, in that apart from Vermont, few states among the top ten in WIC participation actually had significant percentages of WIC High Participation Counties. Among the three states with the next highest scores, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Nevada, only Nevada had a majority of High Participation counties. In fact, no other states had a majority of high serving counties.

High scores on the WIC participation scale among the top ten states primarily reflected the near absence of Low Participation Counties. In these ten states, only 6 of a possible 477 counties (1 percent), had low levels of WIC support.

The top ten states in WIC participation also included New Hampshire, Maryland, South Carolina, Ohio, North Carolina and Wyoming. Of these six states, Wyoming had the highest percentage of counties with high levels of WIC participation, although it also had a high percentage of Low Participation Counties.

Seven of Ten Lowest Scoring States in the West

The significant gap between the most and least successful states in the level of WIC participation substantially reflects consistently low scores among western states. The ten states with the lowest scores included six western states: Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. In each of these states, WIC Low Participation Counties comprised at least 30 percent of all counties and the percentage of High Participation Counties was never higher than

TABLE V-4
1984 WIC Participation Scores and Rank by State

State	Score	Rank 1/	State	Score	Rank 1/
Vermont	100	1	Virginia	3	26
Wisconsin	46	2	West Virginia	2	27
Michigan	43	3	Alaska	0	28
Nevada	41	4	Dist. of Col.	0	28
New Hampshire	40	5	Oklahoma	-4	30
Maryland	38	6	Maine	-6	31
South Carolina	37	7	Florida	-10	32
Ohio	31	8	Colorado	-13	33
North Carolina	31	8	Utah	-14	34
Wyoming	30	10	Massachusetts	-14	34
Mississippi	29	11	Indiana	-15	36
Missouri	26	12	California	-19	37
Georgia	26	12	New Jersey	-20	38
Connecticut	25	14	Arkansas	-23	39
Illinois	20	15	Washington	-28	40
Rhode Island	20	15	South Dakota	-28	40
North Dakota	19	17	Oregon	-31	42
Alabama	12	18	Delaware	-33	43
Tennessee	12	18	Idaho	-34	44
Minnesota	11	20	Nebraska	-35	45
New York	10	21	Arizona	-36	46
Iowa	10	21	New Mexico	-41	47
Kentucky	9	23	Montana	-42	48
Louisiana	9	23	Kansas	-47	49
Pennsylvania	4	25	Texas	-51	50
			Hawaii	-75	51

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

8 percent. In Montana, 17 of 27 Low Participation Counties provided WIC benefits to no children.

Other states with very low WIC participation scores in 1984 included Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and Delaware.[1] These states contained a significant number of Low Participation Counties where no children received WIC benefits.

Texas had the second lowest rating of all states in the Nation. Over 60 percent of Texas counties were WIC Low Participation Counties. Of these, 87 percent (135 of 155) were counties where no children received WIC benefits. In fact, no children were served in over half of all Texas counties. The number of Texas counties in which no children were served by the program represented 41 percent of all such counties in the entire Nation.

In nearly all of the Low Participation Counties in Kansas (57 of 63), no children received WIC benefits. Nebraska's very low rating reflected a near majority of Low Participation Counties, 58 percent of which served no children.

ONLY ONE IN SEVEN OF THE POOREST COUNTIES HAD STRONG WIC PROGRAMS; BENEFITS LACKING OR LOW IN 17 PERCENT

This section describes the relationship between child poverty and children's participation in WIC at the county level. Those counties that were both Child Poverty Counties -- counties with child poverty rates above 25 percent according to the 1980 Census -- and WIC High Participation Counties are described first, followed by counties that were both Child Poverty Counties and WIC Low Participation Counties.

1/ In 1986, substantial numbers of new WIC programs had been instituted in Texas, Kansas and several other states. These are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.

High Participation in Fewer Than 100 Poor Counties

Like the AFDC and Head Start programs, the number of counties with high levels of child poverty that also had high percentages of children receiving benefits was exceedingly low.

Only 95, or 15 percent, of all Child Poverty Counties were also WIC High Participation Counties in 1984 (Table H-3, Appendix H). As in Head Start and AFDC, the poorest counties are not those where service levels were greatest.

Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties were found in 20 states, the vast majority in the South. Fully 82 of the 95 Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties were in southern states, led by Georgia, which had 17, and Mississippi, which had 16.

Yet even in these two cases, the percentage of all Child Poverty Counties in the state that were High Participation Counties was quite low. The 17 Georgia Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties represented only 23 percent of all of Georgia's poorest counties, and the 16 Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties in Mississippi represented only 28 percent of the counties in that state where poverty among children was most concentrated.

Inadequate Support in Over 15 Percent of Poorest Counties

In 1984, 103 counties with extreme concentrations of poverty, 17 percent, also had low WIC participation (Table H-4, Appendix H).

In 40 of these counties, 6 percent of the poorest counties, no children participated in the program.

Twenty states had at least one Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation County. Highest of all states was Texas, which had 32 Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation Counties. In 25 of these counties, no children received WIC benefits, which means that in one-third of the 78 poorest counties in Texas, no children received nutritional benefits through WIC.

While Texas had the greatest number of Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation Counties, the percentage of such counties was higher in other states. In Montana, all eight Child Poverty Counties were WIC Low Participation Counties, and four of these counties provided no benefits.

Six of ten Nebraska Child Poverty Counties were WIC Low Participation Counties, while 21 of 36, 58 percent, of all the poorest counties in South Dakota had an inadequate WIC program.

—

APPENDIX A

HOW THE DATA WERE OBTAINED

This chapter describes the sources of data and data gathering procedures employed in this study.

OBTAINING CHILD POVERTY DATA

Apart from national and regional analyses, county-level child poverty statistics are the primary basis for estimating low-income children's program participation throughout this study. This is accomplished by comparing the number of children at or below the poverty line in a given county to the number of impoverished children receiving AFDC, Head Start or WIC benefits in that county.

This section describes the source of county-level child poverty statistics, as well as national and regional poverty data.

Appendix B also provides a detailed description of how county-level statistics were used to estimate children's program participation in both 1979 and 1984.

1979 Child Poverty Data

Data on the number and percentage of children in poverty in each U.S. county were obtained from the 1980 Decennial Census. These are the most recent county-level poverty statistics available. (1980 Decennial Census poverty statistics actually reflect children's and families' income and poverty status in 1979.) "Children in poverty" refers to related children under 18 years of age in families with incomes at or below the poverty threshold.

National and regional poverty data for 1979 were collected from the U.S. Bureau of the Census' 1980 Current Population Survey (CPS).

1984 Poverty Data

National and regional poverty data for 1984 were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1985 CPS. Neither county nor state-level poverty data for 1984 were available.

OBTAINING AFDC PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 AFDC Data

Data on the number of children in households receiving AFDC benefits during February, 1979, were obtained from "Public Assistance Recipients and Cash Payments by State and County - February 1979" published by the Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

AFDC participation data were available for all counties except a small number of counties in which the program was administered in an adjacent county. These counties were in Minnesota (Murray and Lyon Counties, administered in Lincoln County; Fairbault and Watonwan Counties, administered in Martin County); New York (Bronx, Kings, Queens, and Richmond Counties, administered in New York County); and Virginia (Bedford City, administered in Bedford County; Fairfax City, administered in Fairfax County; Poquoson County, administered in York County; Salem County, administered in Roanoke County; and South Boston County, administered in Halifax County).

1984 AFDC Data

Unlike 1979 data, 1984 county-level AFDC participation statistics for the Nation were not available directly from federal government publications. Beginning in 1981, the Office of Management and Budget directed the Social Security Administration to collect data on children's participation in AFDC for only those counties that are part of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Data on counties not within a SMSA are no longer collected.

Consequently, the Select Committee collected county-level AFDC participation data directly from state officials. Each state was asked to provide data on the number of children in families receiving regular AFDC benefits, and the number of children in families receiving AFDC benefits because the primary earner was unemployed (AFDC - UP), during March, 1984. These data were later combined to yield a single count of all children receiving AFDC benefits in each county.

The procedure for collecting the data was as follows: State AFDC program officials were informed by telephone of the nature of the study and the data on children's participation that was required. A letter formally requesting the data was then sent either to the AFDC program administrator or the appropriate state official designated by the administrator.1/

All 50 states and the District of Columbia provided participation data.

It should be noted, however, that Connecticut, Montana, and Nevada did not have county-level participation data for March, 1984. For these three states, data for February, 1984, were substituted. (February is the month for which AFDC data are collected for the federal government.) In each case, state officials assured the Committee that caseloads during February did not vary substantially from March caseloads.

1/ A copy of the letter requesting AFDC data is included in Appendix J.

As in 1979, AFDC participation data were not available for several counties because the program is administered by a neighboring county. The counties where this occurred in 1984 are the same as in 1979.

As noted earlier, in both 1979 and 1984, AFDC monthly income eligibility limits (payment standards) were below the official poverty level in every state. Although it infrequently occurs, some children receiving AFDC may live in non-poor families. For example, children are eligible for benefits where the total income of all family members is above the poverty level, but the income of those included in the AFDC "filing unit" (the child and his or her parents or legal guardians) is below both the AFDC payment standard and the poverty line. This might occur when a child over 18 years old with some income continues to reside in the home. Also, in states with the highest payment levels, the amount of the AFDC benefit, in combination with allowable earnings after all deductions and disregards, could push some AFDC families above the poverty level.

However, the number of non-poor children receiving AFDC benefits is very small. Inclusion of these few non-poor children does not appreciably inflate the percentages of low-income children served by AFDC.

OBTAINING HEAD START PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 Head Start Data

Data on the number of children (ages 3 - 5) enrolled in Head Start for school year 1978-1979 were obtained from Head Start Funding Guidance records of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The data reflect the number of children in regular Head Start programs, as well as the number of Native Americans and migrant children served by the program. Not included are children in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other U.S. Territories, or children in programs that only operated during the summer.

Head Start is required to provide 10 percent of its slots for handicapped children, subject to the same income restrictions as non-handicapped children. These children are included in the Head Start participation data used in this study.

In addition, up to 10 percent of a Head Start grantee's service population may be from non-poor families. These non-poor children are included in the participation data as well. However, at no time will the percentage of non-poor Head Start children exceed 10 percent.

Inclusion of non-poor children in this study does not appreciably inflate the estimated percentages of low-income children served by Head Start.

1984 Head Start Data

National Head Start enrollment data for school year 1983-1984 were also collected from ACYF Funding Guidance records. County-level Head Start data were obtained from ACYF as well. However, these data are drawn from a special survey conducted in preparation for a program expansion which occurred in 1985. (Counties where no Head Start program existed in 1984, but where one was begun in 1985, are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.)

As in 1979, the data reflect as many as 10 percent handicapped and 10 percent non-poor children. Children in U.S. Territories are excluded.

It should be noted that data pertaining to the number of Head Start enrollees during the 1978-1979 school year are noted in the Head Start Funding Guidance records under fiscal year 1978 (October 1, 1977 - September 30, 1978) and those children enrolled in the 1983-84 school year are noted under fiscal year 1983 (October 1, 1982 - September 30, 1983). In each case, the data reflect the number of children enrolled in the first month of the school year, September, which is the last month of the fiscal year. So, for example, the 395,000 children that were enrolled in Head Start from September, 1983, to September, 1984 are listed under fiscal year 1983 in ACYF records.

OBTAINING WIC PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 WIC Data

State-level data on the average number of children receiving WIC benefits monthly in fiscal year 1979 were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service. Specifically, the data reflect the average monthly number of infants (under one year) and children (under five years) receiving WIC benefits in FY 1979.

1984 WIC Data

Data on the number of infants and children receiving WIC benefits in each U.S. county in 1984 were obtained directly from state WIC officials using the same procedures employed to obtain 1984 AFDC data (see p. 78).

More so than AFDC and Head Start data, county-level WIC participation figures must be considered estimates of the number of children served. This is due primarily to the fact that local WIC agencies often serve families in more than one county. Participation data are normally recorded at the agency level; therefore, exact counts of the number of individuals served within a county are often impossible. For those agencies serving several counties, state WIC officials provided the Committee estimates of the number of recipients served in each county.

A similar problem arose in the case of WIC agencies serving Indian reservations which extended into several counties. Again, state officials estimated the numbers served in each county.

Adjustments To 1984 WIC Data

Infants and children who live in families with incomes up to 185 percent of official poverty thresholds, and who are diagnosed as being nutritionally at risk, are eligible for WIC benefits. States may set income criteria that are lower than 185 percent of poverty, but not less than 100 percent of the poverty line. The most common state eligibility standard is the federally allowed maximum of 185 percent, although 14 states had lower limits in fiscal year 1985 (Maine, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Alaska, Arizona, and California). (See Appendix C for a discussion of how the WIC program operates.)

Consequently, some of the children enumerated in the WIC participation data submitted to the Select Committee would be expected to live in non-poor families. Since the study focuses on children served by WIC who live in families with income at or below the poverty level, it was necessary to adjust WIC participation figures to reflect the best estimate of the number of children receiving WIC benefits who were actually below the poverty line.

National and regional data on the monthly income of families in which children received WIC benefits in March and April, 1984, were available from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Because the April data were derived from a larger sample, these data were used to estimate the percentage of WIC children who lived in families with incomes below the poverty line.

The following procedure was used: For households of different size, a monthly-income poverty standard was created by dividing the annual poverty income threshold by 12. Children in families with monthly incomes below this figure were considered poor for the purposes of this analysis.

Because of the sample size used in the SIPP study, estimates of the percentage of children receiving WIC who were in poor families could only be computed for the Nation and the four regions. The percentage of WIC children who were poor in each region was applied to counties within the region, thereby adjusting downward the numbers of children receiving WIC. Of all WIC children (infants and children up to age 5) in the Northeast, 56.1 percent were poor; in the South, 65 percent; in the Midwest, 66.5 percent; and in the West, 56 percent.

All other poverty data in this report are official estimates based on families' annual income. To be consistent, it would have been preferable to determine the percentage of children receiving WIC who are actually poor based on the annual income of families in the program, which would very likely be lower than those reported in Chapter V. However, these data were not available from the SIPP study.

As a result, monthly family income was used instead. The use of monthly family income data to determine the percentage of children receiving WIC who are poor produces different estimates than would have been produced if annual income data had been used.

Family income can very substantially from month to month. For families with annual incomes that are below the poverty line, monthly variations may occasionally cause their income to climb above the poverty threshold during a month, while the reverse will occur for families with an annual income above the poverty level. Because more families have annual incomes in the range immediately above the poverty line than in the range just below, such monthly fluctuations in income might be expected to cause monthly poverty rates to exceed annual poverty rates. The number of families that are not poor on an annual basis but who experience an income decrease that drops them below the poverty line for a given month will likely be greater than the number of families that are poor for the year but whose incomes rise above the poverty line for that month. The number of poor families in any given month would thus be expected to exceed the number of families that are poor over a full year, and monthly poverty rates would be greater than annual poverty rates.

Moreover, the degree to which monthly and annual poverty levels differ will vary depending on the month chosen for comparison. That is, for many families, income is seasonal, often with predictable month-to-month fluctuations. These seasonal changes would add to the probability that monthly income for many families would not truly indicate their annual poverty status.

As a result, the percentages estimated here of children receiving WIC who are actually poor, which are based on monthly income data, would tend to be higher than estimates based on annual income data.

Applying regional data on the percentage of children receiving WIC who are poor to county participation data is the best available method to adjust WIC participation data. The term "synthetic estimates" was used by the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics to describe this method of estimation.[1] It is important to note that in using this method there will likely be instances where the actual percentage of WIC children who were poor in a given county differs from the regional average. Where this is true, estimates of the percentage of poor children receiving WIC benefits reported here would tend to over- or underestimate the true rate of participation to some degree. Again, these errors are unavoidable given existing data.

Finally, in the 14 states where the WIC eligibility limit is less than 185 percent of the poverty threshold, the percentage of children receiving benefits who are poor may be somewhat higher than it is in states with the maximum income limit. As a result, adjusting total counts of children receiving benefits to reflect the regional proportion of poor children receiving benefits may underestimate the actual percentage of recipients who are poor in these states.

If this were a significant source of bias in the data, we would expect these states to cluster at the bottom in terms of WIC participation. However, this was not found -- participation levels among these states varied widely.

1/ See "Synthetic State Estimates of Disability," published in 1968 by the National Center for Health Statistics, PHS Publication No. 1759.

APPENDIX B

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the methods used to determine national and regional participation levels for AFDC, Head Start and WIC in 1984 and 1979 and the procedures developed to compare levels of participation among counties and states. Methodological issues that may affect the interpretation of the study's findings are also discussed.

ESTIMATING LOW-INCOME CHILDREN'S PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AT THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL

For 1984 and 1979, national estimates of the percentage of low-income children receiving Head Start and WIC benefits, and national and regional estimates of the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits, were determined by comparing the number of children receiving benefits during a representative month (or in the case of Head Start, during the 1978-79 and 1983-84 school years), to the total number of age-eligible, poor children in 1979 and 1984 as estimated in the 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys.

ESTIMATING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

Problems in Computing County Rates

For 1979, county-level participation rates for AFDC were determined by comparing the number of children receiving benefits to the number of low-income children. However, county participation rates for Head Start and WIC could not be determined because program participation data for that year were unavailable.

For 1984, county-level participation data were available for AFDC, WIC, and Head Start. However, county-level poverty statistics were unavailable, making it impossible to calculate participation rates for that year. As noted earlier, county poverty statistics are only available from the 1980 Decennial Census.

An alternative method for estimating county-level participation was developed. For each county, the number of children receiving AFDC, WIC or Head Start services in 1984 was compared to the number of poor children of the appropriate ages in the county in 1979. The percentages derived from these comparisons were used to rank all counties from highest to lowest in terms of the degree to which low-income children were served.

These rankings were divided into fifths, each fifth containing approximately 620 counties. Counties in the highest fifth for a particular program were designated as "High Participation Counties" for that program, while counties in the lowest fifth were designated as "Low Participation Counties." These High and Low Participation Counties formed the basis for all subsequent county-level analyses.

We chose to make use of quintiles as a way of assessing participation at the county level as opposed to the actual percentages derived by comparing 1979 poverty data to 1984 participation data because of the large increase in poverty among children between 1979 and 1984. 1979 poverty data do not reflect this increase. Consequently, a comparison of these data to 1984 participation data would tend to inflate the actual level of program participation among low-income children.

The method that was employed is based on an assumption that if 1984 poverty statistics were available and compared to 1984 participation data, the majority of the High and Low Participation Counties identified would be the same as those identified in this analysis, using 1979 poverty data. Differences in the rate of increase in poverty among counties, or the fact that poverty in some counties may actually have decreased, might create some discrepancies. However, it is unlikely that these differences would substantially alter the composition of these quintiles.

Given existing data, no attempt is made to assess the actual level of program participation in any county (that is, a specific participation rate), only the relative levels of service between counties, cast in broad terms. While this does not preclude the potential for error in classifying some counties, this method represents the soundest approach available for characterizing how well low-income children are served in this Nation at the county level.

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION SCALES BASED ON COUNTY PARTICIPATION INDICES

As with county participation rates, the rate at which low-income children received AFDC, Head Start, and WIC benefits by state could not be determined directly because of the lack of up-to-date state-level poverty data.

In lieu of a direct measure, state "Participation Scales" were developed to characterize differences among states in the relative level of AFDC, Head Start, and WIC support provided to low-income children in 1984, and, in the case of AFDC, to contrast the level of support afforded poor children in 1979 and 1984.

Each state's score provides an indication of how well low-income children were served in the state, and a way of ranking each state's level of support vis-a-vis all other states.

For each program, the Participation Scale was derived by subtracting the percentage of Low Participation Counties in a state from the percentage of High Participation Counties in that state. This yields a single measure of participation for each state. Thus, depending on the percentage of High and Low Participation Counties in the state, a state's score could range from -100 to 100.

For example, in the state of Alabama, 12 of 67 (18 percent) of all counties were Head Start High Participation Counties. Twenty-one Alabama counties, 31 percent, were Head Start Low Participation Counties. Alabama's Head Start Participation Score was equal to 18 minus 31, or -13.

Accuracy of the Method

The accuracy of state Participation Scales in depicting state-level program participation can be tested by comparing states' rank on the 1979 county-based AFDC Participation Scale, described above, to their rank on a scale using the average monthly percentages of poor children served by each state in that year. (1979 is the only year for which this comparison can be done because of the limitations on program participation and poverty data described earlier.)

A rank order correlation of states' rank on the 1979 AFDC Participation Scale and their rank based directly on the percentages served showed an exceptionally strong, positive relationship between the two variables. The strength of the relationship was well beyond all conventional criteria of statistical significance (Spearman's Rho = .531, $P. < .001$).

What the test shows is that a state's rank on the 1979 AFDC Participation Scale is generally very similar to its rank on a measure of participation which takes account of the actual number of children served in a state. For example, 13 of the top 15 states on the AFDC Participation Scale were also in the top 15 on the direct measure of state AFDC participation. Similarly, 13 of the lowest 15 states on the AFDC Participation Scale were in the bottom 15 on the direct measure.

The results of this test strongly suggest that the state Participation Scales, based on the percentages of High and Low Participation Counties in each state, are reliable measures of program participation at the state level.

ISSUES RELATED TO THE DETERMINATION OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION RATES FOR LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

Disparity Between Monthly and Annual Data

As noted earlier, comparing the number of children who are poor on an annual basis to the number of children receiving benefits during one month differs from a comparison of the number of children in families with income below poverty during that month to the number of participating children. Generally, one would expect there to be more "monthly poor" than "annually poor." (Appendix A, p. 84)

This, for the most part, explains why AFDC participation rates contained in this report for some states and counties are reported as being more than 100 percent. Percentages above 100 percent reflect the differences in reporting periods between AFDC program participation data, reported monthly, and poverty figures, reported annually. In these states and counties, there were more children with incomes low enough to receive AFDC benefits during that month than there were children in families with income below the poverty level during the entire year.

Participation rates above 100 percent also reflect the slight possibility that some children receiving AFDC are in families above the poverty line (Appendix A, p. 80).

Neither monthly nor annual poverty rates are necessarily superior indicators of true need. It can be argued that monthly poverty rates are more closely aligned to AFDC and WIC eligibility criteria and would, therefore, serve as better indicators of need. However, monthly poverty rates cannot take into account a family's ability to defer expenditures during months with low income until incomes are higher in the future. The need to take this into consideration is implicit in the AFDC assets test which families must pass in addition to the income test. Thus annual poverty rates may, in fact, more truly indicate need. On the other hand, annual poverty rates are less sensitive to the immediate needs of families which cannot be postponed.

APPENDIX C

HOW THE PROGRAMS OPERATE [1]

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)

Program Description

Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) was established and permanently authorized by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act of 1935 as a cash grant program to enable states to aid needy children without fathers. Renamed Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), the program provides cash payments to needy children and their mothers or other caretaker relatives.

States determine standards of financial need and maximum benefit levels, and administer the program or supervise its administration; Federal law governs the treatment of recipients' earnings.

All states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands offer AFDC to needy children without able-bodied parents at home, and 26 jurisdictions offer Federal cash supplements also to children in two-parent families who are needy because of the unemployment of one of their parents (Aid to Families with Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents [AFDC-UP]).

Financing and Administration

The Federal government pays at least 50 percent of each state's benefit payments and more than 70 percent in 11 States. The federal share for AFDC varies among states, ranging from 50 percent to 78 percent, and it is inversely related to state per capita income. Under matching formulas in the law, about 55 percent of each AFDC benefit dollar is paid by the Federal government and 45 percent is paid by the states, some of which require local governments to share costs. At the start of FY 1984, ten states required their localities to pay some portion of the benefit costs.

---

[1] This section relies heavily on Federal Programs Affecting Children, published by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, January, 1984, and Background Material And Data On Programs Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, published by the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, March, 1986.

The Federal government pays 50 percent of administrative costs in all states. The program is administered on the federal level by the Office of Family Assistance, Social Security Administration, in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and by state and county income assistance offices on the state and local level.

Eligibility

Children are eligible who have been deprived of parental support or care because a parent is absent from home continuously (84.2 percent of the children); are incapacitated (3.4 percent); deceased (1.8 percent); or unemployed (8.7 percent). Of the group of absent parents (nearly always the father), 19.5 percent were divorced or legally separated, 19 percent were not legally separated, 44.3 percent were not married, and 3.1 percent were absent for other unknown reasons.1/

Eligibility for AFDC ends on a child's 18th birthday, or at state option upon a child's 19th birthday if the child is a full-time student in a secondary or technical school and may reasonably be expected to complete the program before he or she reaches age 19.

1/ AFDC Quality Control Study for Fiscal Year 1983, Office of Family Assistance, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Eligibility for AFDC on the basis of a parent's unemployment is limited to those families in which the principal wage earner is employed less than 100 hours per month. AFDC and AFDC-UP eligibility are determined monthly.

Current Benefit and Participation Levels

Each state establishes a "need standard" (the income the state decides is essential for basic consumption items) and a "payment standard" (100 percent or less of the need level). Benefits are determined monthly and generally computed by subtracting countable income from the state's payment standard. (See Table III-11, p. 51, for state payment standards as of July 1985.)

To receive AFDC payments, a family must pass two income tests: first, a gross income test, and second, a counted ("net") income test. The gross income test is currently 185 percent of the state's need standard for the relevant family size. To be eligible for actual payment, however, the family's counted income also must be below the state's payment standard. Maximum AFDC payments vary sharply from state to state (see Table III-9, p. 44, for maximum payments as of January, 1986.) Average benefits per average AFDC family (2.9 persons) were $338 per month in fiscal year 1985, compared to $321 a year earlier.

In 1985, 10.8 million individuals participated in the AFDC program, of whom 7.2 million, or 66 percent, were children. These individuals comprised 3.7 million families, of which 273,000 or 7 percent were two-parent families aided because of the unemployment of a parent.

APDC for Unemployed Parents (AFDC-UP)

The number of AFDC-UP state programs has varied in recent years. There were 29 in September, 1979, 23 in December, 1982, and 26 in January, 1986. During the 1970's, the AFDC-UP program served a monthly average of 120,000 families. In recent years, the monthly average number of AFDC-UP families has risen: fiscal year 1981, 209,000 families; fiscal year 1982, 232,000; fiscal year 1983, 272,000; and fiscal year 1984, 288,000. In fiscal year 1985, the number dropped to 273,000. In fiscal year 1985, AFDC-UP families (averaging 4.4 persons) received payments averaging $518 per family, compared to $479 a year earlier.

OBRA Eligibility Limits and Recent Amendments

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA, P.L. 97-35) changed AFDC rules significantly. The new rules primarily affected families with earnings and children living with their stepparents. For most such families, benefits were terminated or reduced. In 1984, Congress again revised the AFDC program, restoring eligibility to some of the families affected by the 1981 changes.

As noted in Chapter III, of the 22 provisions in OBRA which affected the AFDC program, the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) identified six that had the most effect on program participation:

- A limitation on gross income to 150 percent of the state "need standard" (the amount of income determined by the state as necessary to meet a minimal standard of living);
- The imposition of a 4-month limit on eligibility for an existing provision in which the first $30 of earned income and one-third of the remainder were disregarded in the calculation of AFDC benefits;
- The placement of a $75 ceiling on work expense deductions for full-time employment;

-- The placement of a $160 ceiling on the child care expense deduction for each child;

-- The inclusion of the income of stepparents; and

-- The limitation of assets to $1,000.

In June of 1984, Congress enacted the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-369). This law, which took effect on October 1, 1984, includes AFDC amendments which significantly altered OBRA provisions.

1. Gross income limitation. Under prior law, eligibility for AFDC was limited to families with gross incomes at or below 150 percent of the state's standard of need. The 1984 act increased the gross income limitation to 185 percent of the state standard of need.

2. Work expense deduction. Under prior law, states were required to disregard the first $75 of monthly earnings for full-time work expenses; a lower deduction applied to part-time workers. The 1984 Act requires states to disregard the first $75 monthly for both full and part-time workers.

3. Continuation of $30 disregard. Under prior law, the $30 plus one-third of remaining earnings disregard was limited to four months. The 1984 law retains the 4-month limit on the one-third disregard but extends the $30 disregard for an additional 8 months for a total of 12 months.

4. Work transition status. Under prior law, a family which lost AFDC eligibility due to the 4-month limit on the earnings disregard simultaneously lost categorical eligibility for Medicaid. The 1984 Act provides that families who lose AFDC because of the termination of the earnings disregard will be eligible for 9 months of Medicaid coverage. At state option, an additional 6 months of Medicaid coverage can be

provided. In addition, families who lost AFDC eligibility prior to enactment of the work transition will also be eligible for Medicaid under certain specified circumstances.

Work Requirements and Programs

Federal law requires certain able-bodied recipients, including mothers whose youngest child is at least six years old, to register for work or job training. States may require work registrants to participate in one of several work programs: Work Incentive (WIN) Programs; Community Work Experience Programs (CWEP), Work Supplementation, or Job Search.

The WIN program and WIN demonstrations

The WIN program was established in 1967 with the purpose of providing skills assessments, job training, and employment placements to help AFDC recipients become self-supporting. At the Federal level, the program is jointly administered by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services. A dual administration is also in place at the state level, unless the state has elected to operate a WIN demonstration project. These projects, authorized by OBRA, permit states to design an alternative to WIN, administered solely by state welfare agencies. By January, 1986, 26 states were operating WIN demonstrations.

Community work experience program

Under authority granted by OBRA, states may operate community work experience programs (CWEP) if they so choose. These programs are commonly referred to as "workfare" and require adult AFDC recipients to perform some sort of community work, such as park beautification or serving as a teacher aide, in exchange for the AFDC benefit.

States may require CWEP participation by most AFDC recipients who are registered for WIN. However, unlike WIN, which exempts parents with children under the age of six from the work requirement, CWEP may require parents caring for children under age six (but not under age three) to participate if child care is available.

As of January, 1986, four states had opted to implement some kind of community work experience program. Most state workfare programs are not statewide.

Work supplementation and grant diversion

OBRA also permits states to operate work supplementation programs, in which AFDC may be used to subsidize a job for an AFDC recipient. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 amended the work supplementation program requirements. Under the new law: (1) recipients may be placed in jobs offered by private as well as nonprofit employers; (2) states are permitted, but not required, to offer a $30 plus one-third earned income disregard for up to nine months for participants; (3) federal funding is limited to the aggregate of nine months worth of unreduced welfare grants for each participant in the work supplementation program (or less if the person participates for fewer than nine months); and (4) a state is permitted to develop its own method by which AFDC grants are diverted to wages and is not limited to prior law requirements.

Eleven states have requested and received waivers which permit them to operate a similar program called grant diversion, in which a state may use the AFDC benefit as a wage subsidy to encourage employers to hire AFDC recipients.

Job search

States are also permitted to require AFDC applicants and recipients to participate in a program of employment search beginning at the time of application. After an initial 8-week search period for applicants, AFDC recipients may be required to participate in eight weeks of job search each year.

At state option the job search requirement may be limited to certain groups or classes of individuals who are required to register for WIN. Transportation and other necessary costs incurred by participants must be reimbursed. States receive 50 percent Federal matching funds for these costs.

Medicaid and Food Stamps

States must provide Medicaid to families receiving cash assistance under AFDC. When families lose AFDC eligibility, categorical Medicaid eligibility also frequently ends, except under certain circumstances (see p. 97). Most AFDC families are also eligible for and participate in the Food Stamp program. Although food stamp benefits are not counted in determining AFDC eligibility, the food stamp program does consider AFDC payments to be countable income and reduces the food stamp benefit by $0.30 for each dollar of countable cash income.

HEAD START

Program Description

The Head Start program has been in operation since 1965 and is authorized through fiscal year 1986 under the Head Start Act, as amended.

Head Start provides educational, social, medical, and nutritional services in child day care settings to primarily low-income preschool children, usually between the ages of 3 and 5. The program is particularly designed to bridge the gap in early childhood development between economically disadvantaged preschool children and their more advantaged peers, so that they might begin their formal education on a more equal basis. The program stresses parent participation and involvement in both program development and operation.

In 1983, the most recent year for which data are available, there were 8,700 regular centers across the country. Head Start also funds roughly 400 migrant programs and 300 Indian programs. There are also around 35 parent-child centers, which provide services to infants 0 through age 3, and their parents and older siblings.

About 10 percent of the Head Start programs are full-day, 82 percent are half-day, and 8 percent are combinations of full- and half-day. No fees are charged families participating in the programs, although families able and willing to pay the cost of participation may do so.

Financing and Administration

The appropriation was $1.087 billion for Head Start for fiscal year 1986. However, the actual amount of funding available to the program in FY 1986 was $1.04 billion after sequester, pursuant to P.L. 99-177 (The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985). In FY 1987, the appropriation was $1.130 billion.

Funds are allocated by state, but are distributed in the form of competitive grants to local Head Start agencies. The federal share is 80 percent. Grantees may provide their 20 percent share in cash or in kind, by providing space, volunteers, or other forms of support. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to waive the matching requirement and allow a higher federal share.

The administering agency is the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Office of Human Development, at the Department of Health and Human Services. The program is administered at the local level by Head Start agencies.

Eligibility

To be eligible for Head Start, children must live in families with an income at or below the poverty threshold. At grantee option, however, up to 10 percent of participating children may be from non-poor families. In addition, at least 10 percent of children served must be handicapped.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

Program Description

The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) was established in 1972, amending the Child Nutrition

Act of 1966. It has been extended through fiscal year 1987 by continuing resolution.

WIC distributes federal funds to states and certain recognized Indian tribes or groups to provide supplemental foods to low-income, pregnant, postpartum, and nursing mothers, and infants and children up to age 5 who are diagnosed as being at nutritional risk. It also provides nutrition counseling and education.

Food benefits are provided monthly, and consist of specified items which vary in type and quantity according to the nutritional needs of the participant. These consist largely of high protein foods such as dairy products, cereals, fruit and vegetable juices and infant formula. Participants either receive the food from the local agency, or purchase it from a retail outfit through the use of a voucher issued by the local agency. This voucher specifies the items and quantities which may be purchased by the participant, and is the most common form of food delivery in the WIC program.

In May of 1986, program participation reached a level of 3.3 million women, infants and children, with an average monthly food cost per participant of approximately $32.00.

Financing and Administration

In FY 1987, $1.66 billion was appropriated for WIC.

The WIC program is administered at the federal level by the Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. The Service makes cash grants to participating State health departments or comparable State agencies. These WIC agencies, in turn, distribute funds to participating local WIC agencies in their jurisdiction. Local agencies may include city or county health departments, or any of a variety of public or private nonprofit health or human service organizations such as hospitals, maternal and child health groups, or community action programs.

Eligibility

Participants must show evidence of nutritional deficiency and have an income that is no higher than 185 percent of the poverty level in order to be eligible for the program. States may set income criteria that are lower than 185 percent of the poverty level; however, such criteria may not be less than 100 percent of this level. In fiscal year 1985, 14 states had income criteria less than 185 percent of the poverty level: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia.

APPENDIX D

Child Poverty Counties

Page
Table D-1—Child Poverty Counties 107

TABLE D-1

Child Poverty Counties

ALABAMA:
- Barbour
- Bibb
- Bullock
- Butler
- Choctaw
- Clarke
- Conecuh
- Coosa
- Crenshaw
- Dallas
- Escambia
- Greene
- Hale
- Henry
- Lawrence
- Lowndes
- Macon
- Marengo
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pickens
- Pike
- Randolph
- Russell
- Sumter
- Washington
- Wilcox

ARIZONA:
- Apache
- Navajo

ARKANSAS:
- Arkansas
- Bradley
- Calhoun
- Chicot
- Columbia
- Crittenden
- Cross
- Desha
- Fulton
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Lafayette
- Lee
- Lincoln
- Marion
- Mississippi
- Monroe
- Nevada
- Newton
- Ouachita
- Phillips

ARKANSAS—Cont.
- Poinsett
- Polk
- Prairie
- Scott
- Searcy
- Sharp
- St. Francis
- Stone
- Woodruff

COLORADO:
- Baca
- Conejos
- Costilla
- Dolores
- Huerfano
- Las Animas
- Otero
- Saguache

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
- Washington

FLORIDA:
- Calhoun
- De Soto
- Dixie
- Flagler
- Franklin
- Gadsden
- Gulf
- Hamilton
- Hardee
- Hendry
- Highlands
- Holmes
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Levy
- Liberty
- Madison
- Putnam
- St. Lucie
- Sumter
- Suwannee
- Taylor
- Walton
- Washington

GEORGIA:
- Appling
- Atkinson
- Bacon
- Baker

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Ben Hill
- Bibb
- Brooks
- Burke
- Calhoun
- Camden
- Candler
- Charlton
- Clay
- Clinch
- Coffee
- Crisp
- Decatur
- Dodge
- Dooly
- Dougherty
- Early
- Echols
- Emanuel
- Evans
- Fulton
- Grady
- Greene
- Hancock
- Irwin
- Jefferson
- Jenkins
- Johnson
- Lanier
- Liberty
- Lincoln
- Long
- Macon
- Marion
- McIntosh
- Miller
- Mitchell
- Montgomery
- Morgan
- Peach
- Pierce
- Pulaski
- Quitman
- Randolph
- Schley
- Screven
- Seminole
- Stewart
- Sumter
- Talbot
- Taliaferro
- Tattnall
- Taylor
- Telfair

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Terrell
- Thomas
- Tift
- Toombs
- Towns
- Treutlen
- Turner
- Union
- Ware
- Warren
- Washington
- Webster
- Wheeler
- Wilcox
- Worth

IDAHO:
- Owyhee
- Washington

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Pulaski
- St. Clair

IOWA:
- Davis
- Ringgold

KENTUCKY:
- Adair
- Bath
- Bell
- Breathitt
- Breckinridge
- Carter
- Casey
- Christian
- Clay
- Clinton
- Cumberland
- Elliott
- Estill
- Fleming
- Floyd
- Fulton
- Green
- Harlan
- Hart
- Jackson
- Johnson
- Knott
- Knox
- Larue
- Lawrence

KENTUCKY—Cont.
- Lee
- Leslie
- Letcher
- Lewis
- Lincoln
- Madison
- Magoffin
- Marion
- Martin
- McCreary
- Menifee
- Metcalfe
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Morgan
- Owen
- Owsley
- Perry
- Powell
- Pulaski
- Robertson
- Rockcastle
- Russell
- Washington
- Wayne
- Whitley
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- Acadia
- Avoyelles
- Bienville
- Caldwell
- Catahoula
- Claiborne
- Concordia
- De Soto
- East Carroll
- East Feliciana
- Evangeline
- Franklin
- Iberville
- Madison
- Morehouse
- Natchitoches
- Orleans
- Ouachita
- Pointe Coupee
- Red River
- Richland
- Sabine
- St. Helena
- St. Landry
- Tangipahoa

LOUISIANA—Cont.
- Tensas
- Washington
- West Carroll
- West Feliciana
- Winn

MAINE:
- Washington

MARYLAND:
- Baltimore City

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Suffolk

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MINNESOTA:
- Lincoln
- Mahnomen

MISSISSIPPI:
- Adams
- Amite
- Attala
- Benton
- Bolivar
- Calhoun
- Carroll
- Choctaw
- Claiborne
- Clay
- Coahoma
- Copiah
- Covington
- Forrest
- Franklin
- Greene
- Grenada
- Hinds
- Holmes
- Humphreys
- Issaquena
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Jefferson Davis
- Kemper
- Lauderdale
- Leake
- Leflore
- Lincoln
- Lowndes
- Madison
- Marion
- Marshall

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties

MISSISSIPPI—Cont.
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Neshoba
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Oktibbeha
- Panola
- Pearl River
- Perry
- Pike
- Quitman
- Scott
- Sharkey
- Smith
- Sunflower
- Tallahatchie
- Tate
- Tunica
- Walthall
- Washington
- Wayne
- Wilkinson
- Winston
- Yalobusha
- Yazoo

MISSOURI:
- Butler
- Carter
- Douglas
- Dunklin
- Hickory
- Knox
- Mississippi
- New Madrid
- Oregon
- Ozark
- Pemiscot
- Reynolds
- Ripley
- Shannon
- St. Louis City
- Stone
- Wayne
- Worth
- Wright

MONTANA:
- Blaine
- Carter
- Garfield
- Glacier
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum

MONTANA—Cont.
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boyd
- Greeley
- Hayes
- Logan
- Morrill
- Thurston
- Wheeler

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NEW JERSEY:
- Essex
- Hudson

NEW MEXICO:
- De Baca
- Dona Ana
- Guadalupe
- Luna
- McKinley
- Mora
- Rio Arriba
- Roosevelt
- San Miguel
- Sierra
- Socorro
- Taos
- Torrance
- Union

NEW YORK:
- Bronx
- Kings
- New York

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Beaufort
- Bertie
- Bladen
- Cherokee
- Chowan
- Columbus
- Duplin
- Edgecombe
- Gates
- Greene
- Halifax
- Hertford

NORTH CAROLINA—Cont.
- Hoke
- Hyde
- Madison
- Martin
- Nash
- Northampton
- Pender
- Perquimans
- Pitt
- Robeson
- Swain
- Tyrrell
- Vance
- Warren
- Wilson
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Benson
- Billings
- Dunn
- Emmons
- Grant
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Rolette
- Sheridan
- Sioux
- Slope

OHIO:
- Adams
- Pike

OKLAHOMA:
- Adair
- Atoka
- Caddo
- Choctaw
- Coal
- Delaware
- Greer
- Harmon
- Hughes
- Johnston
- Kiowa
- Latimer
- Marshall
- McCurtain
- McIntosh
- Pushmataha
- Tillman

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Philadelphia

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale
- Bamberg
- Calhoun
- Clarendon
- Colleton
- Darlington
- Dillon
- Edgefield
- Fairfield
- Florence
- Georgetown
- Hampton
- Jasper
- Lee
- Marion
- Marlboro
- McCormick
- Orangeburg
- Saluda
- Sumter
- Williamsburg

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Aurora
- Bennett
- Bon Homme
- Brule
- Buffalo
- Campbell
- Charles Mix
- Clark
- Corson
- Deuel
- Dewey
- Douglas
- Edmunds
- Faulk
- Gregory
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Kingsbury
- Lyman
- Marshall
- McPherson
- Mellette
- Miner
- Potter

SOUTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Roberts
- Sanborn
- Shannon
- Sully
- Todd
- Tripp
- Ziebach

TENNESSEE:
- Bledsoe
- Campbell
- Claiborne
- Clay
- Cocke
- Cumberland
- Fayette
- Fentress
- Grundy
- Hancock
- Hardeman
- Haywood
- Jackson
- Johnson
- Lake
- Lauderdale
- Morgan
- Overton
- Pickett
- Scott
- Shelby
- Union

TEXAS:
- Atascosa
- Bailey
- Bee
- Briscoe
- Brooks
- Caldwell
- Cameron
- Castro
- Cochran
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- Cottle
- Crosby
- Dawson
- De Witt
- Dickens
- Dimmit
- Duval
- Edwards
- El Paso
- Falls

TEXAS—Cont.
- Floyd
- Frio
- Gaines
- Glasscock
- Gonzales
- Grimes
- Hale
- Hall
- Hardeman
- Haskell
- Hidalgo
- Hockley
- Houston
- Hudspeth
- Jeff Davis
- Karnes
- Kenedy
- King
- Kinney
- Kleberg
- Knox
- La Salle
- Lamb
- Leon
- Limestone
- Lynn
- Madison
- Marion
- Mason
- Maverick
- McCulloch
- Medina
- Menard
- Mills
- Mitchell
- Motley
- Parmer
- Presidio
- Real
- Red River
- Reeves
- Robertson
- Runnels
- San Augustine
- San Jacinto
- San Saba
- Starr
- Swisher
- Terry
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Webb
- Wilbarger

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties

TEXAS—Cont.
- Willacy
- Zapata
- Zavala

UTAH:
- San Juan

VIRGINIA:
- Accomack
- Brunswick
- Charlotte
- Cumberland
- Franklin

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Greensville
- Lee
- Norfolk
- Northampton
- Petersburg
- Portsmouth
- Prince Edward
- Richmond City
- Southampton
- Surry
- Sussex
- Westmoreland

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Braxton
- Calhoun
- Clay
- Doddridge
- Lincoln
- McDowell
- Mingo
- Pendleton
- Summers
- Webster

APPENDIX E

Tables Relating to Participation Across All Programs

Page

Table E–1—Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC 115
Table E–2—Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC 116
Table E–3—Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start 118
Table E–4—Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC 119
Table E–5—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC 121
Table E–6—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start 123
Table E–7—Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC 126
Table E–8—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC 129
Table E–9—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC 131
Table E–10—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC 132
Table E–11—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start 133
Table E–12—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC 134
Table E–13—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC 135
Table E–14—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC 136
Table E–15—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start 137
Table E–16—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC 138

TABLE E-1

Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

CALIFORNIA:
- Alpine

COLORADO:
- Bent
- Crowley
- Fremont

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Cass
- Massac
- Perry

KANSAS:
- Cherokee
- Crawford
- Shawnee

KENTUCKY:
- McCracken

MARYLAND:
- Charles

MICHIGAN:
- Alger
- Alpena
- Benzie
- Chippewa
- Crawford
- Dickinson
- Gogebic
- Houghton
- Huron
- Iron
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Luce

MICHIGAN—Cont.
- Mackinac
- Menominee
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Roscommon
- Schoolcraft

MINNESOTA:
- Cass
- Itasca
- Koochiching
- Lake
- Mille Lacs
- Polk
- St. Louis
- Wright

MISSISSIPPI:
- Claiborne

MISSOURI:
- Stoddard
- Washington

MONTANA:
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Hall

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Scotland

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Gallia
- Guernsey
- Jackson
- Mercer
- Monroe
- Morrow
- Noble
- Pike
- Preble
- Washington

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Cameron

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Newberry
- Union

VIRGINIA:
- Fredericksburg

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Wirt

WISCONSIN:
- Ashland
- Bayfield
- Florence
- Forest
- Jackson
- Menominee
- Racine
- Sawyer
- Vilas
- Waushara

WYOMING:
- Laramie

TABLE E-2

Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC

ALABAMA:
- Colbert

CALIFORNIA:
- Alpine

COLORADO:
- Bent
- Crowley
- Fremont
- Otero
- Saguache

FLORIDA:
- Okeechobee

GEORGIA:
- Banks
- Butts
- Dawson
- Hall
- Jackson
- Jeff Davis
- Morgan
- Pickens
- Schley
- Stephens
- Stewart
- White
- Whitfield

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Cass
- Massac
- Monroe
- Perry
- Wabash

INDIANA:
- Ohio

IOWA:
- Decatur
- Monona

KANSAS:
- Allen
- Cherokee
- Crawford
- Neosho
- Shawnee

KENTUCKY:
- Ballard
- Calloway
- Fleming
- Grant

KENTUCKY—Cont.
- Lee
- Martin
- McCracken
- Robertson
- Trigg
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- St. Helena
- St. James

MARYLAND:
- Calvert
- Charles
- Howard
- Kent
- Montgomery

MICHIGAN:
- Alger
- Alpena
- Benzie
- Chippewa
- Crawford
- Dickinson
- Gogebic
- Houghton
- Huron
- Iron
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Luce
- Mackinac
- Menominee
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Roscommon
- Schoolcraft

MINNESOTA:
- Big Stone
- Cass
- Cook
- Grant
- Itasca
- Koochiching
- Lake
- Mille Lacs
- Polk
- St. Louis
- Wright

MISSISSIPPI:
- Benton
- Chickasaw
- Claiborne
- Clay
- Franklin
- Greene
- Grenada
- Itawamba
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Lafayette
- Lawrence
- Leake
- Lee
- Montgomery
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Perry
- Prentiss
- Tishomingo
- Warren
- Webster
- Winston
- Yalobusha

MISSOURI:
- Bollinger
- Carter
- Dade
- Holt
- Howard
- Lewis
- Madison
- Phelps
- Reynolds
- Stoddard
- Washington
- Wright

MONTANA:
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Dakota
- Dawes
- Hall

NEVADA:
- Douglas
- Humboldt

NEW MEXICO:
- Union

TABLE E-2—*Cont.*

Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC

NEW YORK:
- Schoharie

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Chatham
- Dare
- Jackson
- Jones
- Macon
- Madison
- Scotland
- Swain
- Yadkin

NORTH DAKOTA:
- McHenry
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Gallia
- Guernsey
- Jackson
- Mercer
- Monroe
- Morrow
- Noble
- Pike
- Preble
- Putnam
- Washington

OKLAHOMA:
- Atoka
- Beckham
- Haskell
- Logan
- Love
- Murray

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
- Nowata
- Tillman

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Cameron

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Abbeville
- Cherokee
- Chester
- Clarendon
- Fairfield
- Laurens
- McCormick
- Newberry
- Union

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Hughes
- Lyman

TENNESSEE:
- Benton
- Chester
- Jackson
- Meigs
- Smith
- Trousdale
- Unicoi

TEXAS:
- Bailey
- Bee
- Dimmit
- Jim Hogg
- Mills

TEXAS—Cont.
- Tom Green
- Willacy
- Zapata
- Zavala

VERMONT:
- Addison
- Caledonia
- Essex

VIRGINIA:
- Botetourt
- Craig
- Fredericksburg

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Wirt

WISCONSIN:
- Ashland
- Bayfield
- Florence
- Forest
- Jackson
- Menominee
- Price
- Racine
- Sawyer
- Vilas
- Waushara

WYOMING:
- Goshen
- Hot Springs
- Laramie
- Platte
- Washakie

TABLE E-3

Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start

- CALIFORNIA:
  - Alpine
  - Imperial
  - Lake
  - Madera
  - Napa
- COLORADO:
  - Alamosa
  - Bent
  - Crowley
  - Fremont
- ILLINOIS:
  - Alexander
  - Cass
  - Coles
  - Massac
  - Perry
  - Pulaski
- INDIANA:
  - Floyd
  - St. Joseph
- IOWA:
  - Boone
  - Clay
- KANSAS:
  - Cherokee
  - Crawford
  - Labette
  - Shawnee
- KENTUCKY:
  - McCracken
- MAINE:
  - Franklin
- MARYLAND:
  - Charles
  - Queen Anne's
  - Somerset
- MICHIGAN:
  - Alger
  - Alpena
  - Baraga
  - Benzie
  - Chippewa
  - Crawford
  - Dickinson
  - Gladwin
  - Gogebic
  - Houghton
  - Huron
- MICHIGAN—Cont.
  - Iron
  - Jackson
  - Keweenaw
  - Lake
  - Luce
  - Mackinac
  - Menominee
  - Montmorency
  - Newaygo
  - Ontonagon
  - Osceola
  - Oscoda
  - Roscommon
  - Schoolcraft
- MINNESOTA:
  - Beltrami
  - Cass
  - Itasca
  - Koochiching
  - Lake
  - Mille Lacs
  - Polk
  - St. Louis
  - Wright
- MISSISSIPPI:
  - Claiborne
- MISSOURI:
  - Dunklin
  - Mississippi
  - Scott
  - Stoddard
  - Washington
- MONTANA:
  - Silver Bow
- NEBRASKA:
  - Adams
  - Hall
  - Thurston
- NORTH CAROLINA:
  - Scotland
- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Rolette
- OHIO:
  - Delaware
  - Gallia
  - Guernsey
  - Highland
  - Jackson
- OHIO—Cont.
  - Lucas
  - Mercer
  - Monroe
  - Morrow
  - Noble
  - Ottawa
  - Pike
  - Preble
  - Scioto
  - Warren
  - Washington
- PENNSYLVANIA:
  - Cameron
- SOUTH CAROLINA:
  - Newberry
  - Union
- UTAH:
  - Carbon
- VIRGINIA:
  - Fredericksburg
- WASHINGTON:
  - Asotin
  - Clallam
  - Pend Oreille
- WEST VIRGINIA:
  - McDowell
  - Mingo
  - Taylor
  - Wirt
- WISCONSIN:
  - Ashland
  - Bayfield
  - Douglas
  - Florence
  - Forest
  - Iron
  - Jackson
  - Manitowoc
  - Menominee
  - Racine
  - Sauk
  - Sawyer
  - Vilas
  - Washburn
  - Waushara
  - Wood
- WYOMING:
  - Laramie

TABLE E-4

Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

CALIFORNIA:
- Alpine
- Amador
- Del Norte
- San Benito
- Santa Cruz
- Trinity

COLORADO:
- Bent
- Chaffee
- Crowley
- Fremont
- Pueblo

CONNECTICUT:
- Tolland
- Windham

GEORGIA:
- Twiggs

ILLINOIS:
- Adams
- Alexander
- Bond
- Cass
- Effingham
- Fulton
- Grundy
- Hardin
- Henderson
- Lee
- Logan
- Massac
- Menard
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pope
- Randolph
- Stephenson
- Union

IOWA:
- Clinton
- Dallas
- Des Moines
- Linn
- Page
- Union
- Wapello

KANSAS:
- Cherokee
- Crawford
- Saline
- Shawnee

KENTUCKY:
- McCracken

MARYLAND:
- Allegany
- Charles

MICHIGAN:
- Alger
- Alpena
- Antrim
- Bay
- Benzie
- Charlevoix
- Cheboygan
- Chippewa
- Crawford
- Delta
- Dickinson
- Emmet
- Gogebic
- Grand Traverse
- Houghton
- Huron
- Iron
- Kalamazoo
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Lapeer
- Luce
- Mackinac
- Manistee
- Marquette
- Mason
- Menominee
- Oceana
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Otsego
- Roscommon
- Sanilac
- Schoolcraft
- Shiawassee
- St. Clair
- Tuscola
- Washtenaw

MINNESOTA:
- Anoka
- Cass
- Clay
- Itasca
- Kandiyohi
- Koochiching
- Lake

MINNESOTA—Cont.
- Mille Lacs
- Olmsted
- Polk
- Ramsey
- St. Louis
- Wright

MISSISSIPPI:
- Claiborne

MISSOURI:
- Boone
- Ralls
- St. Francois
- Stoddard
- Washington

MONTANA:
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Hall
- Lincoln

NEVADA:
- Esmeralda

NEW JERSEY:
- Warren

NEW YORK:
- Chautauqua
- Orleans

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Scotland

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Auglaize
- Clark
- Crawford
- Darke
- Erie
- Gallia
- Guernsey
- Harrison
- Henry
- Hocking
- Jackson
- Mahoning
- Meigs
- Mercer

TABLE E-4—*Cont.*

Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

OHIO—Cont.
- Miami
- Monroe
- Morgan
- Morrow
- Noble
- Paulding
- Perry
- Pickaway
- Pike
- Preble
- Ross
- Tuscarawas
- Van Wert
- Vinton
- Washington

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Blair
- Cameron
- Elk
- Fayette
- Greene
- Washington
- Westmoreland
- Wyoming

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale
- Newberry
- Union

VERMONT:
- Bennington
- Chittenden
- Franklin
- Rutland
- Windsor

VIRGINIA:
- Buena Vista
- Charlottesville
- Fredericksburg
- Hopewell
- Richmond City
- Staunton

WASHINGTON:
- Chelan
- Columbia

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Wirt

WISCONSIN:
- Ashland
- Bayfield
- Brown
- Burnett
- Door
- Eau Claire
- Florence
- Fond du Lac
- Forest
- Jackson

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Jefferson
- Juneau
- Kewaunee
- La Crosse
- Langlade
- Lincoln
- Marathon
- Marinette
- Marquette
- Menominee
- Oneida
- Pepin
- Portage
- Racine
- Rock
- Rusk
- Sawyer
- Sheboygan
- St. Croix
- Trempealeau
- Vilas
- Walworth
- Waushara

WYOMING:
- Carbon
- Laramie
- Natrona
- Sheridan
- Uinta

TABLE E-5

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

- COLORADO:
  - Cheyenne
  - Eagle
  - Grand
  - Pitkin
  - Summit

- IDAHO:
  - Blaine
  - Butte
  - Caribou
  - Franklin
  - Fremont
  - Jefferson
  - Lincoln
  - Madison
  - Oneida
  - Teton

- INDIANA:
  - Lagrange
  - Marshall
  - Pulaski
  - Rush

- KANSAS:
  - Barber
  - Coffey
  - Comanche
  - Decatur
  - Edwards
  - Ellis
  - Ellsworth
  - Gove
  - Graham
  - Harper
  - Haskell
  - Hodgeman
  - Jewell
  - Kiowa
  - Lincoln
  - Marion
  - Meade
  - Ness
  - Norton
  - Osborne
  - Pratt
  - Rawlins
  - Republic
  - Russell
  - Sheridan
  - Smith
  - Stanton
  - Trego
  - Washington

- MONTANA:
  - Carter
  - Daniels
  - Fallon
  - Fergus
  - Garfield
  - Golden Valley
  - Judith Basin
  - Liberty
  - Madison
  - McCone
  - Musselshell
  - Petroleum
  - Prairie
  - Sheridan
  - Sweet Grass
  - Toole
  - Treasure
  - Wheatland
  - Wibaux

- NEBRASKA:
  - Arthur
  - Banner
  - Blaine
  - Boone
  - Butler
  - Chase
  - Cuming
  - Dixon
  - Frontier
  - Furnas
  - Garfield
  - Gosper
  - Hayes
  - Hitchcock
  - Hooker
  - Logan
  - McPherson
  - Nance
  - Pawnee
  - Perkins
  - Pierce
  - Polk
  - Thomas
  - Wayne

- NEVADA:
  - Eureka
  - Nye

- NEW MEXICO:
  - Lincoln
  - Los Alamos

- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Golden Valley
  - Logan
  - Oliver
  - Stark

- OKLAHOMA:
  - Alfalfa
  - Beaver
  - Cimarron
  - Dewey
  - Ellis
  - Grant
  - Harper
  - Woodward

- OREGON:
  - Wheeler

- SOUTH DAKOTA:
  - Campbell
  - Clark
  - Deuel
  - Hamlin
  - Hanson
  - Harding
  - Jackson

- TEXAS:
  - Anderson
  - Archer
  - Armstrong
  - Bandera
  - Borden
  - Briscoe
  - Callahan
  - Carson
  - Collingsworth
  - Concho
  - Coryell
  - Delta
  - Donley
  - Eastland
  - Edwards
  - Erath
  - Fisher
  - Foard
  - Franklin
  - Hamilton
  - Hansford
  - Hartley
  - Haskell
  - Hemphill
  - Hood
  - Hopkins
  - Irion
  - Jack

TABLE E-5—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

TEXAS—Cont.
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kimble
- King
- Knox
- Lee
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Moore
- Motley
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham

TEXAS—Cont.
- Parker
- Rains
- Reagan
- Roberts
- Rockwall
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Throckmorton
- Van Zandt

TEXAS—Cont.
- Wheeler
- Wise
- Wood
- Young

UTAH:
- Beaver
- Rich
- Wayne

VIRGINIA:
- Lexington
- Rockingham

WYOMING:
- Lincoln
- Sublette

TABLE E-6

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

ALABAMA:
- Bibb
- Blount
- Chilton
- Dale
- Lamar
- Marion
- Winston

ARKANSAS:
- Grant
- Howard
- Lonoke
- Montgomery
- Pike
- Sevier

CALIFORNIA:
- Sierra

COLORADO:
- Baca
- Cheyenne
- Custer
- Douglas
- Eagle
- Grand
- Hinsdale
- Kit Carson
- Ouray
- Park
- Pitkin
- Summit
- Yuma

GEORGIA:
- Brantley
- Murray

IDAHO:
- Adams
- Bear Lake
- Blaine
- Butte
- Caribou
- Clark
- Custer
- Elmore
- Franklin
- Fremont
- Jefferson
- Lemhi
- Lincoln
- Madison
- Oneida
- Owyhee
- Teton

INDIANA:
- Lagrange
- Marshall
- Pulaski
- Rush

IOWA:
- Mitchell

KANSAS:
- Barber
- Cheyenne
- Coffey
- Comanche
- Decatur
- Dickinson
- Edwards
- Ellis
- Ellsworth
- Gove
- Graham
- Greeley
- Harper
- Haskell
- Hodgeman
- Jewell
- Kiowa
- Lincoln
- Marion
- Marshall
- Meade
- Ness
- Norton
- Osborne
- Pratt
- Rawlins
- Republic
- Russell
- Sheridan
- Smith
- Stanton
- Trego
- Washington

LOUISIANA:
- Cameron

MONTANA:
- Broadwater
- Carter
- Chouteau
- Daniels
- Fallon
- Fergus
- Garfield
- Golden Valley
- Judith Basin

MONTANA—Cont.
- Liberty
- Madison
- McCone
- Meagher
- Musselshell
- Petroleum
- Phillips
- Powder River
- Prairie
- Sheridan
- Stillwater
- Sweet Grass
- Teton
- Toole
- Treasure
- Wheatland
- Wibaux

NEBRASKA:
- Antelope
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boone
- Boyd
- Brown
- Butler
- Chase
- Cherry
- Cuming
- Dixon
- Franklin
- Frontier
- Furnas
- Garfield
- Gosper
- Harlan
- Hayes
- Hitchcock
- Holt
- Hooker
- Johnson
- Kearney
- Keya Paha
- Logan
- McPherson
- Nance
- Pawnee
- Perkins
- Pierce
- Polk
- Rock
- Stanton

TABLE E-6—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Thomas
- Wayne

NEVADA:
- Eureka
- Lander
- Lincoln
- Nye
- Pershing

NEW MEXICO:
- Harding
- Lincoln
- Los Alamos

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Alexander
- Alleghany
- Ashe
- Currituck
- Polk
- Randolph
- Wilkes

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Adams
- Barnes
- Billings
- Bowman
- Burke
- Cavalier
- Dickey
- Divide
- Emmons
- Golden Valley
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- La Moure
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Nelson
- Oliver
- Pembina
- Ransom
- Renville
- Richland
- Sheridan
- Slope
- Stark
- Steele
- Towner
- Walsh
- Wells

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Cimarron
- Dewey
- Ellis
- Grant
- Harper
- Major
- Woods
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Morrow
- Sherman
- Wheeler

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Bon Homme
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Grant
- Haakon
- Hamlin
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Jones
- Lincoln
- McCook
- Moody
- Perkins
- Potter
- Stanley
- Sully

TENNESSEE:
- Lewis
- Van Buren

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Andrews
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Bandera
- Borden
- Brewster
- Briscoe
- Callahan
- Carson
- Castro
- Collingsworth
- Comanche
- Concho

TEXAS—Cont.
- Coryell
- Crane
- Culberson
- Delta
- Donley
- Eastland
- Edwards
- Erath
- Fisher
- Foard
- Franklin
- Gaines
- Glasscock
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hemphill
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Hudspeth
- Irion
- Jack
- Jeff Davis
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kimble
- King
- Knox
- Lamb
- Lee
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- McMullen
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Moore
- Motley
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parker
- Parmer
- Pecos
- Presidio
- Rains
- Randall
- Reagan
- Roberts
- Rockwall
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford

TABLE E-6—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

- TEXAS—Cont.
  - Sherman
  - Somervell
  - Stephens
  - Sterling
  - Stonewall
  - Sutton
  - Terrell
  - Throckmorton
  - Van Zandt
  - Ward
  - Wheeler
  - Winkler
  - Wise
  - Wood
  - Yoakum
  - Young
- UTAH:
  - Beaver
  - Daggett
  - Garfield
  - Juab
  - Kane
  - Millard
  - Morgan
  - Rich
  - Sanpete
  - Summit
  - Washington
  - Wayne
- VIRGINIA:
  - Essex
  - Falls Church
  - Frederick
  - Lexington
- VIRGINIA—Cont.
  - Madison
  - Mecklenburg
  - Middlesex
  - Page
  - Powhatan
  - Rockingham
  - Spotsylvania
- WASHINGTON:
  - San Juan
- WYOMING:
  - Crook
  - Lincoln
  - Sublette

TABLE E-7

Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

ARKANSAS:
- Calhoun

CALIFORNIA:
- Calaveras
- Mariposa

COLORADO:
- Cheyenne
- Clear Creek
- Delta
- Eagle
- Elbert
- Garfield
- Grand
- Jackson
- Kiowa
- Montrose
- Pitkin
- Rio Blanco
- Summit

FLORIDA:
- Highlands
- Monroe
- Santa Rosa

IDAHO:
- Blaine
- Boundary
- Butte
- Camas
- Caribou
- Franklin
- Fremont
- Jefferson
- Lincoln
- Madison
- Oneida
- Teton

ILLINOIS:
- Douglas
- Kendall
- McDonough

INDIANA:
- Benton
- Carroll
- Cass
- Clinton
- Hamilton
- Jasper
- Johnson
- Kosciusko
- Lagrange
- Marshall

INDIANA—Cont.
- Miami
- Montgomery
- Morgan
- Newton
- Posey
- Pulaski
- Rush
- Shelby
- Starke
- Tipton
- Union
- White

IOWA:
- Cedar
- Grundy

KANSAS:
- Anderson
- Barber
- Barton
- Clark
- Clay
- Cloud
- Coffey
- Comanche
- Decatur
- Edwards
- Elk
- Ellis
- Ellsworth
- Gove
- Graham
- Gray
- Hamilton
- Harper
- Haskell
- Hodgeman
- Jewell
- Kingman
- Kiowa
- Lane
- Leavenworth
- Lincoln
- Logan
- Marion
- McPherson
- Meade
- Mitchell
- Morris
- Morton
- Ness
- Norton
- Osborne
- Ottawa

KANSAS—Cont.
- Pawnee
- Phillips
- Pottawatomie
- Pratt
- Rawlins
- Republic
- Rice
- Rooks
- Rush
- Russell
- Seward
- Sheridan
- Smith
- Stafford
- Stanton
- Sumner
- Trego
- Washington
- Wilson
- Woodson

KENTUCKY:
- Meade

LOUISIANA:
- Plaquemines
- West Baton Rouge

MONTANA:
- Carbon
- Carter
- Daniels
- Fallon
- Fergus
- Garfield
- Golden Valley
- Judith Basin
- Liberty
- Madison
- McCone
- Musselshell
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Sheridan
- Sweet Grass
- Toole
- Treasure
- Wheatland
- Wibaux

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boone

TABLE E-7—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Butler
- Chase
- Colfax
- Cuming
- Deuel
- Dixon
- Dundy
- Frontier
- Furnas
- Garden
- Garfield
- Gosper
- Grant
- Hayes
- Hitchcock
- Hooker
- Logan
- McPherson
- Nance
- Pawnee
- Perkins
- Pierce
- Polk
- Sarpy
- Saunders
- Thomas
- Washington
- Wayne

NEVADA:
- Eureka
- Nye

NEW MEXICO:
- Lea
- Lincoln
- Los Alamos

NEW YORK:
- Putnam

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Golden Valley
- Logan
- Oliver
- Stark

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Cimarron
- Dewey
- Ellis
- Grant
- Harper

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
- Roger Mills
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Benton
- Curry
- Gilliam
- Grant
- Harney
- Lake
- Wheeler

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Northumberland

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Hamlin
- Hanson
- Harding
- Jackson

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Austin
- Bandera
- Baylor
- Borden
- Briscoe
- Callahan
- Camp
- Carson
- Chambers
- Coke
- Collingsworth
- Colorado
- Concho
- Coryell
- Crockett
- Delta
- Donley
- Eastland
- Edwards
- Ellis
- Erath
- Falls
- Fayette
- Fisher
- Foard
- Franklin
- Freestone

TEXAS—Cont.
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardin
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hemphill
- Henderson
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Houston
- Hunt
- Irion
- Jack
- Jasper
- Johnson
- Jones
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kerr
- Kimble
- King
- Knox
- Lamar
- Lavaca
- Lee
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Menard
- Milam
- Mitchell
- Moore
- Morris
- Motley
- Newton
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parker
- Rains
- Reagan
- Roberts
- Rockwall
- San Jacinto
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Throckmorton

TABLE E-7—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

- TEXAS--Cont.
  - Titus
  - Trinity
  - Tyler
  - Van Zandt
  - Waller
  - Wheeler
  - Wise
  - Wood
  - Young

- UTAH:
  - Beaver
  - Rich
  - Sevier
  - Wayne

- VIRGINIA:
  - Bath
  - Buchanan
  - Clarke
  - Colonial Heights
  - Emporia
  - Hampton
  - Harrisonburg
  - Highland
  - Lexington
  - Manassas
  - Richmond
  - Rockingham
  - Shenandoah
  - Waynesboro
  - Winchester

- WASHINGTON:
  - Pacific
  - Lewis
  - Whitman
  - Garfield

- WEST VIRGINIA:
  - Jefferson

- WISCONSIN:
  - Calumet

- WYOMING:
  - Lincoln
  - Sublette
  - Teton

TABLE E-8

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

- ARKANSAS:
  - Boone
  - Carroll
  - Cleburne
  - Garland
  - Greene
  - Logan
  - Madison
  - Polk
  - Sebastian
  - Stone
  - White

- COLORADO:
  - Cheyenne
  - Eagle
  - Grand
  - Pitkin
  - Summit

- FLORIDA:
  - Clay

- IDAHO:
  - Blaine
  - Butte
  - Caribou
  - Franklin
  - Fremont
  - Gooding
  - Jefferson
  - Lincoln
  - Madison
  - Oneida
  - Teton

- INDIANA:
  - Lagrange
  - Marshall
  - Pulaski
  - Rush

- IOWA:
  - Lyon

- KANSAS:
  - Barber
  - Coffey
  - Comanche
  - Decatur
  - Edwards
  - Ellis
  - Ellsworth
  - Gove
  - Graham
  - Harper
  - Haskell

- KANSAS—Cont.
  - Hodgeman
  - Jewell
  - Kiowa
  - Lincoln
  - Marion
  - Meade
  - Ness
  - Norton
  - Osborne
  - Pratt
  - Rawlins
  - Republic
  - Russell
  - Scott
  - Sheridan
  - Smith
  - Stanton
  - Trego
  - Washington

- MINNESOTA:
  - Renville
  - Rock

- MONTANA:
  - Carter
  - Daniels
  - Fallon
  - Fergus
  - Garfield
  - Golden Valley
  - Judith Basin
  - Liberty
  - Madison
  - McCone
  - Musselshell
  - Petroleum
  - Prairie
  - Sheridan
  - Sweet Grass
  - Toole
  - Treasure
  - Wheatland
  - Wibaux
  - Yellowstone National Park

- NEBRASKA:
  - Arthur
  - Banner
  - Blaine
  - Boone
  - Butler
  - Cedar
  - Chase

- NEBRASKA—Cont.
  - Cuming
  - Dixon
  - Frontier
  - Furnas
  - Garfield
  - Gosper
  - Greeley
  - Hayes
  - Hitchcock
  - Hooker
  - Knox
  - Logan
  - McPherson
  - Nance
  - Pawnee
  - Perkins
  - Pierce
  - Polk
  - Saline
  - Sioux
  - Thayer
  - Thomas
  - Valley
  - Wayne

- NEVADA:
  - Eureka
  - Nye

- NEW MEXICO:
  - Catron
  - Lincoln
  - Los Alamos
  - Otero
  - Valencia

- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Dunn
  - Golden Valley
  - Grant
  - Logan
  - Oliver
  - Stark

- OHIO:
  - Holmes

- OKLAHOMA:
  - Alfalfa
  - Beaver
  - Canadian
  - Cimarron
  - Dewey
  - Ellis
  - Grant

TABLE E-8—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
- Harper
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Wheeler

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Douglas
- Faulk
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Jackson
- Kingsbury
- Marshall

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Bandera
- Blanco
- Borden
- Bosque
- Briscoe
- Burnet
- Callahan
- Carson
- Clay
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- Cooke
- Coryell
- Cottle
- Dallam
- Delta
- Dickens
- Donley

TEXAS—Cont.
- Eastland
- Edwards
- Erath
- Fisher
- Foard
- Franklin
- Gillespie
- Gray
- Guadalupe
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardeman
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hemphill
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Hutchinson
- Irion
- Jack
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kimble
- King
- Knox
- Lampasas
- Lee
- Leon
- Limestone
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Llano
- Mason
- McCulloch
- Medina
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Montague
- Moore
- Motley

TEXAS—Cont.
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parker
- Rains
- Reagan
- Real
- Roberts
- Rockwall
- Runnels
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Swisher
- Throckmorton
- Uvalde
- Van Zandt
- Wheeler
- Wilbarger
- Wilson
- Wise
- Wood
- Young

UTAH:
- Beaver
- Rich
- Wayne

VIRGINIA:
- Lexington
- Rockingham
- Virginia Beach

WYOMING:
- Lincoln
- Sublette

TABLE E-9

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

ILLINOIS:
Alexander

MICHIGAN:
Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
Claiborne

NORTH DAKOTA:
Rolette

OHIO:
Pike

TABLE E-10

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC

COLORADO:
- Otero
- Saguache

GEORGIA:
- Morgan
- Schley
- Stewart

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander

KENTUCKY:
- Fleming
- Lee
- Martin
- Robertson
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- St. Helena

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Benton
- Claiborne
- Clay

MISSISSIPPI—Cont.
- Franklin
- Greene
- Grenada
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Leake
- Montgomery
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Perry
- Winston
- Yalobusha

MISSOURI:
- Carter
- Reynolds
- Wright

NEW MEXICO:
- Union

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Madison
- Swain

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Pike

OKLAHOMA:
- Atoka
- Tillman

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Clarendon
- Fairfield
- McCormick

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Lyman

TENNESSEE:
- Jackson

TEXAS:
- Bailey
- Bee
- Dimmit
- Mills
- Willacy
- Zapata
- Zavala

TABLE E-11

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start

---

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Pulaski

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Claiborne

MISSOURI:
- Dunklin
- Mississippi

NEBRASKA:
- Thurston

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Pike

WEST VIRGINIA:
- McDowell
- Mingo

TABLE E–12

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

ILLINOIS:
  Alexander

MICHIGAN:
  Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
  Claiborne

NORTH DAKOTA:
  Rolette

OHIO:
  Pike

SOUTH CAROLINA:
  Allendale

VIRGINIA:
  Richmond City

TABLE E-13

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

MONTANA:
- Carter
- Garfield
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Hayes
- Logan

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Logan

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Hamlin
- Hanson
- Harding
- Jackson

TEXAS:
- Briscoe
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- Edwards
- Haskell
- Kenedy
- King
- Knox
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Motley

TABLE E-14

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

ARKANSAS:
- Polk
- Stone

MONTANA:
- Carter
- Garfield
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Greeley
- Hayes
- Logan

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Dunn
- Grant
- Logan

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Douglas
- Faulk
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Jackson
- Kingsbury
- Marshall

TEXAS:
- Briscoe
- Collingsworth
- Concho

TEXAS—Cont.
- Cottle
- Dickens
- Edwards
- Hall
- Hardeman
- Haskell
- Kenedy
- King
- Knox
- Leon
- Limestone
- Mason
- McCulloch
- Medina
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Motley
- Real
- Runnels
- Swisher
- Uvalde
- Wilbarger

TABLE E-15

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

---

ALABAMA:
- Bibb

COLORADO:
- Baca

IDAHO:
- Owyhee

MONTANA:
- Carter
- Garfield
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boyd
- Hayes
- Logan

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Billings
- Emmons
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Sheridan
- Slope

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Bon Homme
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Hamlin
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Potter
- Sully

TEXAS:
- Briscoe
- Castro
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- Edwards
- Gaines
- Glasscock
- Haskell
- Hudspeth
- Jeff Davis
- Kenedy
- King
- Knox
- Lamb
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Motley
- Parmer
- Presidio

TABLE E-16

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

- ARKANSAS:
  - Calhoun
- FLORIDA:
  - Highlands
- MONTANA:
  - Carter
  - Garfield
  - Judith Basin
  - Petroleum
  - Prairie
  - Treasure
- NEBRASKA:
  - Arthur
  - Banner
  - Blaine
- NEBRASKA—Cont.
  - Hayes
  - Logan
- NEVADA:
  - Eureka
- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Logan
- SOUTH DAKOTA:
  - Campbell
  - Clark
  - Deuel
  - Hamlin
  - Hanson
  - Harding
  - Jackson
- TEXAS:
  - Briscoe
  - Collingsworth
  - Concho
  - Edwards
  - Falls
  - Haskell
  - Houston
  - Kenedy
  - King
  - Knox
  - Menard
  - Mitchell
  - Motley
  - San Jacinto

APPENDIX F

Tables Relating to Participation in AFDC

Page

Table F-1—Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County 141
Table F-2—1984 AFDC High Participation Counties 206
Table F-3—1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties 211
Table F-4—1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County 216
Table F-5—1979 AFDC High Participation Counties 253
Table F-6—1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties 258
Table F-7—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC—1984 263
Table F-8—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC—1984 264
Table F-9—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC—1979 266
Table F-10—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC—1979 267

TABLE F-1

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Alabama:				
Autauga	1,194	867	−327	−27
Baldwin	1,336	1,179	−157	−12
Barbour	1,388	1,119	−269	−19
Bibb	412	309	−103	−25
Blount	411	370	−41	−10
Bullock	756	789	33	4
Butler	1,091	1,079	−12	−1
Calhoun	3,069	2,436	−633	−21
Chambers	1,557	1,339	−218	−14
Cherokee	186	240	54	29
Chilton	555	417	−138	−25
Choctaw	1,179	795	−384	−33
Clarke	1,649	1,475	−174	−11
Clay	254	174	−80	−31
Cleburne	172	135	−37	−22
Coffee	753	596	−157	−21
Colbert	1,043	786	−257	−25
Conecuh	935	514	−421	−45
Coosa	424	281	−143	−34
Covington	850	505	−345	−41
Crenshaw	600	433	−167	−28
Cullman	498	454	−44	−9
Dale	602	629	27	4
Dallas	4,259	4,151	−108	−3
De Kalb	728	640	−88	−12
Elmore	1,202	877	−325	−27
Escambia	1,309	927	−382	−29
Etowah	2,033	1,548	−485	−24
Fayette	268	358	90	34
Franklin	532	442	−90	−17
Geneva	774	515	−259	−33
Greene	1,340	1,111	−229	−17
Hale	1,193	935	−258	−22
Henry	839	411	−428	−51
Houston	2,241	1,455	−786	−35
Jackson	698	608	−90	−13
Jefferson	23,223	19,945	−3,278	−14
Lamar	303	220	−83	−27
Lauderdale	1,274	945	−329	−26
Lawrence	1,092	549	−543	−50
Lee	1,692	1,408	−284	−17
Limestone	999	653	−346	−35
Lowndes	1,903	1,325	−578	−30
Macon	2,310	1,940	−370	−16
Madison	3,881	3,068	−813	−21
Marengo	2,016	1,386	−630	−31
Marion	394	293	−101	−26
Marshall	1,002	715	−287	−29

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Mobile	14,987	15,030	43	0
Monroe	1,026	718	−308	−30
Montgomery	7,019	6,987	−32	−0
Morgan	1,718	1,484	−234	−14
Perry	1,474	1,341	−133	−9
Pickens	1,666	1,356	−310	−19
Pike	1,294	1,211	−83	−6
Randolph	515	445	−70	−14
Russell	1,285	1,252	−33	−3
Shelby	1,041	727	−314	−30
St. Clair	885	712	−173	−20
Sumter	1,650	1,366	−284	−17
Talladega	3,598	3,091	−507	−14
Tallapoosa	1,283	744	−539	−42
Tuscaloosa	4,882	4,332	−550	−11
Walker	1,749	1,253	−496	−28
Washington	448	738	290	65
Wilcox	2,178	1,508	−670	−31
Winston	215	129	−86	−40
Total	127,332	107,770	−19,562	−15
Alaska:				
Alaska	9,955	9,037	−918	−9
Total	9,955	9,037	−918	−9
Arizona:				
Apache	3,338	3,406	68	2
Cochise	1,023	1,819	796	78
Coconino	1,637	1,745	108	7
Gila	665	1,151	486	73
Graham	455	779	324	71
Greenlee	149	201	52	35
Maricopa	15,185	23,814	8,629	57
Mohave	236	604	368	156
Navajo	1,872	2,304	432	23
Pima	6,292	10,076	3,784	60
Pinal	2,187	3,361	1,174	54
Santa Cruz	250	467	217	87
Yavapai	300	853	553	184
Yuma	730	1,302	572	78
Total	34,319	51,882	17,563	51
Arkansas:				
Arkansas	716	492	−224	−31
Ashley	1,087	682	−405	−37
Baxter	169	143	−26	−15
Benton	848	319	−529	−62
Boone	248	155	−93	−38
Bradley	450	282	−168	−37
Calhoun	212	162	−50	−24
Carroll	128	85	−43	−34

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Chicot	1,859	1,427	−432	−23
Clark	414	327	−87	−21
Clay	443	330	−113	−26
Cleburne	153	107	−46	−30
Cleveland	182	112	−70	−38
Columbia	1,063	856	−207	−19
Conway	451	333	−118	−26
Craighead	956	835	−121	−13
Crawford	507	478	−29	−6
Crittenden	3,351	2,329	−1,022	−30
Cross	841	685	−156	−19
Dallas	433	332	−101	−23
Desha	1,314	867	−447	−34
Drew	453	331	−122	−27
Faulkner	307	245	−62	−20
Franklin	125	113	−12	−10
Fulton	127	4	−123	−97
Garland	1,226	634	−592	−48
Grant	121	83	−38	−31
Greene	438	359	−79	−18
Hempstead	574	0	−574	−100
Hot Spring	410	381	−29	−7
Howard	167	69	−98	−59
Independence	383	320	−63	−16
Izard	106	111	5	5
Jackson	746	604	−142	−19
Jefferson	3,485	3,535	50	1
Johnson	236	106	−130	−55
Lafayette	520	397	−123	−24
Lawrence	399	319	−80	−20
Lee	1,725	1,189	−536	−31
Lincoln	640	492	−148	−23
Little River	399	247	−152	−38
Logan	352	283	−69	−20
Lonoke	701	412	−289	−41
Madison	150	113	−37	−25
Marion	130	118	−12	−9
Miller	1,153	840	−313	−27
Mississippi	2,957	2,096	−861	−29
Monroe	1,005	712	−293	−29
Montgomery	111	40	−71	−64
Nevada	465	252	−213	−46
Newton	164	102	−62	−38
Ouachita	1,369	856	−513	−37
Perry	131	80	−51	−39
Phillips	4,330	3,313	−1,017	−23
Pike	167	95	−72	−43
Poinsett	1,034	859	−175	−17
Polk	370	211	−159	−43
Pope	541	412	−129	−24

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Prairie	285	194	−91	−32
Pulaski	10,442	5,301	−5,141	−49
Randolph	194	158	−36	−19
Saline	555	368	−187	−34
Scott	219	153	−66	−30
Searcy	148	99	−49	−33
Sebastian	1,136	591	−545	−48
Sevier	148	107	−41	−28
Sharp	298	267	−31	−10
St. Francis	2,205	1,950	−255	−12
Stone	231	174	−57	−25
Union	2,001	1,294	−707	−35
Van Buren	210	193	−17	−8
Washington	1,102	751	−351	−32
White	694	449	−245	−35
Woodruff	606	485	−121	−20
Yell	332	194	−138	−42
Total	64,348	44,399	−19,949	−31
California:				
Alameda	49,916	49,987	71	0
Alpine	29	88	59	203
Amador	264	544	280	106
Butte	4,525	6,733	2,208	49
Calaveras	601	1,044	443	74
Colusa	254	504	250	98
Contra Costa	22,435	20,956	−1,479	−7
Del Norte	733	1,416	683	93
El Dorado	1,637	2,671	1,034	63
Fresno	27,087	43,164	16,077	59
Glenn	518	813	295	57
Humboldt	3,909	5,402	1,493	38
Imperial	4,248	4,995	747	18
Inyo	338	607	269	80
Kern	14,044	17,223	3,179	23
Kings	3,925	4,780	855	22
Lake	1,512	1,906	394	26
Lassen	702	1,132	430	61
Los Angeles	367,628	395,459	27,831	8
Madera	3,180	4,087	907	29
Marin	2,371	1,767	−604	−25
Mariposa	236	632	396	168
Mendocino	2,994	3,907	913	30
Merced	7,403	12,400	4,997	67
Modoc	285	492	207	73
Mono	144	128	−16	−11
Monterey	9,780	9,984	204	2
Napa	1,987	2,006	19	1
Nevada	1,004	1,838	834	83
Orange	30,360	38,571	8,211	27

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Placer	3,121	3,968	847	27
Plumas	410	648	238	58
Riverside	24,857	33,633	8,776	35
Sacramento	42,900	56,837	13,937	32
San Benito	727	1,001	274	38
San Bernardino	37,795	52,813	15,018	40
San Diego	57,708	68,477	10,769	19
San Francisco	27,838	24,155	−3,683	−13
San Joaquin	20,938	32,955	12,017	57
San Luis Obispo	2,992	2,982	−10	−0
San Mateo	10,818	6,640	−4,178	−39
Santa Barbara	6,985	6,561	−424	−6
Santa Clara	41,010	39,520	−1,490	−4
Santa Cruz	5,231	4,714	−517	−10
Shasta	4,873	7,714	2,841	58
Sierra	72	0	−72	−100
Siskiyou	1,161	2,238	1,077	93
Solano	8,402	8,727	325	4
Sonoma	9,681	8,863	−818	−8
Stanislaus	12,148	17,358	5,210	43
Sutter	1,878	2,828	950	51
Tehama	1,278	2,008	730	57
Trinity	416	709	293	70
Tulare	15,932	20,836	4,904	31
Tuolumne	803	1,597	794	99
Ventura	14,771	13,295	−1,476	−10
Yolo	3,956	4,876	920	23
Yuba	2,858	4,065	1,207	42
Total	925,608	1,065,254	139,646	15
Colorado:				
Adams	5,526	4,999	−527	−10
Alamosa	334	544	210	63
Arapahoe	1,439	1,699	260	18
Archuleta	70	60	−10	−14
Baca	93	44	−49	−53
Bent	193	192	−1	−1
Boulder	1,699	446	−1,253	−74
Chaffee	212	306	94	44
Cheyenne	9	36	27	300
Clear Creek	26	54	28	108
Conejos	410	355	−55	−13
Costilla	151	145	−6	−4
Crowley	132	158	26	20
Custer	25	12	−13	−52
Delta	514	592	78	15
Denver	19,554	15,119	−4,435	−23
Dolores	47	41	−6	−13
Douglas	42	69	27	64
Eagle	57	50	−7	−12

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
El Paso	4,356	5,245	889	20
Elbert	47	68	21	45
Fremont	637	751	114	18
Garfield	142	211	69	49
Gilpin	7	13	6	86
Grand	34	26	−8	−24
Gunnison	17	46	29	171
Hinsdale	3	1	−2	−67
Huerfano	284	258	−26	−9
Jackson	23	19	−4	−17
Jefferson	2,012	1,196	−816	−41
Kiowa	22	23	1	5
Kit Carson	59	90	31	53
La Plata	525	391	−134	−26
Lake	100	52	−48	−48
Larimer	1,647	1,723	76	5
Las Animas	731	672	−59	−8
Lincoln	51	39	−12	−24
Logan	222	250	28	13
Mesa	1,073	1,821	748	70
Mineral	6	5	−1	−17
Moffat	85	141	56	66
Montezuma	218	391	173	79
Montrose	252	345	93	37
Morgan	518	473	−45	−9
Otero	1,368	1,256	−112	−8
Ouray	21	12	−9	−43
Park	18	14	−4	−22
Phillips	20	41	21	105
Pitkin	20	6	−14	−70
Prowers	595	538	−57	−10
Pueblo	5,749	7,285	1,536	27
Rio Blanco	27	86	59	219
Rio Grande	456	404	−52	−11
Routt	53	39	−14	−26
Saguache	163	158	−5	−3
San Juan	14	13	−1	−7
San Miguel	23	40	17	74
Sedgwick	38	41	3	8
Summit	2	6	4	200
Teller	74	85	11	15
Washington	46	61	15	33
Weld	3,123	2,784	−339	−11
Yuma	101	117	16	16
Total	55,515	52,157	−3,358	−6
Connecticut:				
Fairfield	24,675	20,707	−3,968	−16
Hartford	29,314	26,684	−2,630	−9
Litchfield	1,661	1,512	−149	−9

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Middlesex	1,947	1,704	–243	–12
New Haven	27,127	24,420	–2,707	–10
New London	5,600	4,773	–827	–15
Tolland	1,454	1,176	–278	–19
Windham	2,438	2,987	549	23
Total	94,216	83,963	–10,253	–11
Delaware:				
Kent	15,659	3,219	–12,440	–79
New Castle	3,993	11,519	7,526	188
Sussex	3,050	2,073	–977	–32
Total	22,702	16,811	–5,891	–26
District of Columbia:				
Washington	61,645	45,536	–16,109	–26
Total	61,645	45,536	–16,109	–26
Florida:				
Alachua	3,266	3,664	398	12
Baker	319	341	22	7
Bay	1,674	1,862	188	11
Bradford	555	571	16	3
Brevard	4,128	3,834	–294	–7
Broward	8,070	12,124	4,054	50
Calhoun	252	432	180	71
Charlotte	345	572	227	66
Citrus	798	801	3	0
Clay	653	496	–157	–24
Collier	989	1,292	303	31
Columbia	888	834	–54	–6
Dade	27,446	45,063	17,617	64
De Soto	366	550	184	50
Dixie	194	323	129	66
Duval	18,282	16,908	–1,374	–8
Escambia	7,140	7,895	755	11
Flagler	338	338	0	0
Franklin	342	329	–13	–4
Gadsden	2,631	2,998	367	14
Gilchrist	68	118	50	74
Glades	126	117	–9	–7
Gulf	452	374	–78	–17
Hamilton	384	546	162	42
Hardee	515	699	184	36
Hendry	707	780	73	10
Hernando	714	794	80	11
Highlands	1,093	1,148	55	5
Hillsborough	14,658	1,026	–13,632	–93
Holmes	356	374	18	5
Indian River	919	873	–46	–5
Jackson	1,088	1,133	45	4
Jefferson	442	479	37	8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Lafayette	38	74	36	95
Lake	1,508	1,917	409	27
Lee	2,353	3,575	1,222	52
Leon	3,139	2,714	−425	−14
Levy	450	659	209	46
Liberty	134	186	52	39
Madison	860	748	−112	−13
Manatee	1,749	1,890	141	8
Marion	3,222	3,616	394	12
Martin	611	818	207	34
Monroe	617	618	1	0
Nassau	756	679	−77	−10
Okaloosa	1,556	1,557	1	0
Okeechobee	433	532	99	23
Orange	10,032	8,836	−1,196	−12
Osceola	752	718	−34	−5
Palm Beach	6,777	7,129	352	5
Pasco	1,977	2,797	820	41
Pinellas	8,573	7,924	−649	−8
Polk	4,506	5,895	1,389	31
Putnam	1,825	2,462	637	35
Santa Rosa	882	999	117	13
Sarasota	1,188	1,459	271	23
Seminole	2,651	2,370	−281	−11
St. Johns	942	1,077	135	14
St. Lucie	3,115	3,012	−103	−3
Sumter	793	981	188	24
Suwannee	342	660	318	93
Taylor	490	518	28	6
Union	163	241	78	48
Volusia	4,241	3,956	−285	−7
Wakulla	277	353	76	27
Walton	549	704	155	28
Washington	416	451	35	8
Total	168,115	181,813	13,698	8
Georgia:				
Appling	546	570	24	4
Atkinson	226	209	−17	−8
Bacon	362	428	66	18
Baker	174	136	−38	−22
Baldwin	942	1,231	289	31
Banks	56	65	9	16
Barrow	340	420	80	24
Bartow	663	720	57	9
Ben Hill	458	585	127	28
Berrien	320	348	28	9
Bibb	5,747	7,049	1,302	23
Bleckley	343	381	38	11
Brantley	157	136	−21	−13

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Brooks	883	739	−144	−16
Bryan	345	392	47	14
Bulloch	939	1,285	346	37
Burke	1,295	1,527	232	18
Butts	451	483	32	7
Calhoun	265	279	14	5
Camden	428	417	−11	−3
Candler	280	251	−29	−10
Carroll	1,128	1,217	89	8
Catoosa	462	523	61	13
Charlton	310	329	19	6
Chatham	8,223	8,738	515	6
Chattahoochee	144	115	−29	−20
Chattooga	454	518	64	14
Cherokee	429	407	−22	−5
Clarke	1,235	1,929	694	56
Clay	226	291	65	29
Clayton	1,370	1,831	461	34
Clinch	296	337	41	14
Cobb	1,964	1,621	−343	−17
Coffee	878	998	120	14
Colquitt	1,498	1,650	152	10
Columbia	568	707	139	24
Cook	286	405	119	42
Coweta	1,187	1,626	439	37
Crawford	304	264	−40	−13
Crisp	1,398	1,337	−61	−4
Dade	176	231	55	31
Dawson	55	58	3	5
De Kalb	5,539	7,794	2,255	41
Decatur	1,003	1,381	378	38
Dodge	674	709	35	5
Dooly	796	655	−141	−18
Dougherty	5,586	6,266	680	12
Douglas	593	544	−49	−8
Early	972	978	6	1
Echols	88	90	2	2
Effingham	561	555	−6	−1
Elbert	655	702	47	7
Emanuel	947	1,152	205	22
Evans	452	385	−67	−15
Fannin	173	279	106	61
Fayette	106	121	15	14
Floyd	1,873	2,264	391	21
Forsyth	167	143	−24	−14
Franklin	244	311	67	27
Fulton	29,745	33,530	3,785	13
Gilmer	136	222	86	63
Glascock	44	42	−2	−5
Glynn	1,366	1,421	55	4

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Gordon	387	472	85	22
Grady	690	630	−60	−9
Greene	337	394	57	17
Gwinnett	628	535	−93	−15
Habersham	127	218	91	72
Hall	847	1,187	340	40
Hancock	902	669	−233	−26
Haralson	326	323	−3	−1
Harris	334	291	−43	−13
Hart	264	380	116	44
Heard	139	165	26	19
Henry	813	774	−39	−5
Houston	1,480	1,718	238	16
Irwin	341	331	−10	−3
Jackson	381	324	−57	−15
Jasper	214	168	−46	−21
Jeff Davis	231	179	−52	−23
Jefferson	1,156	1,163	7	1
Jenkins	469	442	−27	−6
Johnson	302	329	27	9
Jones	426	401	−25	−6
Lamar	418	338	−80	−19
Lanier	262	304	42	16
Laurens	729	1,487	758	104
Lee	346	333	−13	−4
Liberty	968	1,083	115	12
Lincoln	189	247	58	31
Long	257	157	−100	−39
Lowndes	1,839	2,542	703	38
Lumpkin	173	154	−19	−11
Macon	1,030	990	−40	−4
Madison	246	316	70	28
Marion	291	228	−63	−22
McDuffie	596	791	195	33
McIntosh	500	374	−126	−25
Meriwether	776	960	184	24
Miller	311	271	−40	−13
Mitchell	1,314	1,446	132	10
Monroe	379	357	−22	−6
Montgomery	306	219	−87	−28
Morgan	363	423	60	17
Murray	114	168	54	47
Muscogee	5,271	6,488	1,217	23
Newton	788	1,195	407	52
Oconee	131	97	−34	−26
Oglethorpe	336	314	−22	−7
Paulding	402	368	−34	−8
Peach	899	1,094	195	22
Pickens	140	125	−15	−11
Pierce	296	246	−50	−17

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Pike	167	129	−38	−23
Polk	733	846	113	15
Pulaski	368	423	55	15
Putnam	350	362	12	3
Quitman	138	150	12	9
Rabun	97	119	22	23
Randolph	410	511	101	25
Richmond	6,306	7,982	1,676	27
Rockdale	470	398	−72	−15
Schley	176	133	−43	−24
Screven	631	755	124	20
Seminole	419	458	39	9
Spalding	1,169	1,525	356	30
Stephens	277	414	137	49
Stewart	511	440	−71	−14
Sumter	1,601	1,600	−1	−0
Talbot	257	303	46	18
Taliaferro	104	110	6	6
Tattnall	669	784	115	17
Taylor	579	524	−55	−9
Telfair	461	493	32	7
Terrell	622	602	−20	−3
Thomas	1,491	1,486	−5	−0
Tift	797	1,128	331	42
Toombs	834	1,001	167	20
Towns	53	53	0	0
Treutlen	309	297	−12	−4
Troup	1,283	1,413	130	10
Turner	421	621	200	48
Twiggs	533	513	−20	−4
Union	102	157	55	54
Upson	795	827	32	4
Walker	681	838	157	23
Walton	608	655	47	8
Ware	1,238	1,331	93	8
Warren	307	308	1	0
Washington	933	858	−75	−8
Wayne	739	839	100	14
Webster	118	109	−9	−8
Wheeler	257	231	−26	−10
White	47	36	−11	−23
Whitfield	691	581	−110	−16
Wilcox	337	293	−44	−13
Wilkes	407	445	38	9
Wilkinson	464	428	−36	−8
Worth	809	884	75	9
Total	150,764	170,928	20,164	13
Hawaii:				
Hawaii	5,109	5,671	562	11

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Honolulu	30,379	25,089	-5,290	-17
Kauai	1,353	1,292	-61	-5
Maui	2,601	2,529	-72	-3
Total	39,442	34,581	-4,861	-12
Idaho:				
Ada	2,580	2,397	-183	-7
Adams	42	28	-14	-33
Bannock	875	791	-84	-10
Bear Lake	42	64	22	52
Benewah	122	198	76	62
Bingham	566	548	-18	-3
Blaine	54	37	-17	-31
Boise	58	59	1	2
Bonner	547	498	-49	-9
Bonneville	697	459	-238	-34
Boundary	75	135	60	80
Butte	31	13	-18	-58
Camas	12	8	-4	-33
Canyon	1,800	1,732	-68	-4
Caribou	82	77	-5	-6
Cassia	257	206	-51	-20
Clark	9	5	-4	-44
Clearwater	151	124	-27	-18
Custer	17	12	-5	-29
Elmore	161	153	-8	-5
Franklin	42	27	-15	-36
Fremont	47	53	6	13
Gem	192	249	57	30
Gooding	155	101	-54	-35
Idaho	207	190	-17	-8
Jefferson	128	60	-68	-53
Jerome	201	196	-5	-2
Kootenai	1,175	1,208	33	3
Latah	232	161	-71	-31
Lemhi	124	111	-13	-10
Lewis	71	83	12	17
Lincoln	19	18	-1	-5
Madison	88	37	-51	-58
Minidoka	242	204	-38	-16
Nez Perce	720	487	-233	-32
Oneida	13	3	-10	-77
Owyhee	176	154	-22	-13
Payette	357	351	-6	-2
Power	112	84	-28	-25
Shoshone	486	532	46	9
Teton	15	31	16	107
Twin Falls	454	484	30	7
Valley	44	58	14	32
Washington	204	155	-49	-24

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Total	13,682	12,581	−1,101	−8
Illinois:				
Adams	1,527	2,042	515	34
Alexander	1,036	1,247	211	20
Bond	202	398	196	97
Boone	289	414	125	43
Brown	46	69	23	50
Bureau	232	558	326	141
Calhoun	55	93	38	69
Carroll	234	361	127	54
Cass	222	375	153	69
Champaign	3,465	3,532	67	2
Christian	561	862	301	54
Clark	160	245	85	53
Clay	199	339	140	70
Clinton	234	435	201	86
Coles	485	1,058	573	118
Cook	351,017	333,030	−17,987	−5
Crawford	240	261	21	9
Cumberland	100	146	46	46
De Kalb	505	897	392	78
De Witt	137	278	141	103
Douglas	216	334	118	55
Du Page	2,955	3,446	491	17
Edgar	187	425	238	127
Edwards	73	130	57	78
Effingham	344	628	284	83
Fayette	396	572	176	44
Ford	224	196	−28	−13
Franklin	1,355	1,562	207	15
Fulton	938	1,589	651	69
Gallatin	195	220	25	13
Greene	415	565	150	36
Grundy	187	480	293	157
Hamilton	195	230	35	18
Hancock	310	354	44	14
Hardin	140	269	129	92
Henderson	131	217	86	66
Henry	636	1,408	772	121
Iroquois	435	548	113	26
Jackson	1,579	1,861	282	18
Jasper	95	144	49	52
Jefferson	1,194	1,532	338	28
Jersey	139	294	155	112
Jo Daviess	80	174	94	117
Johnson	254	314	60	24
Kane	5,744	7,075	1,331	23
Kankakee	5,426	5,974	548	10
Kendall	156	247	91	58

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Knox	895	1,841	946	106
La Salle	1,225	2,364	1,139	93
Lake	7,033	7,835	802	11
Lawrence	354	401	47	13
Lee	249	678	429	172
Livingston	353	649	296	84
Logan	307	667	360	117
Macon	3,416	5,006	1,590	47
Macoupin	934	1,464	530	57
Madison	8,884	9,952	1,068	12
Marion	1,031	1,483	452	44
Marshall	52	222	170	327
Mason	369	798	429	116
Massac	474	659	185	39
McDonough	371	694	323	87
McHenry	681	985	304	45
McLean	1,435	1,866	431	30
Menard	132	215	83	63
Mercer	224	441	217	97
Monroe	146	160	14	10
Montgomery	493	807	314	64
Morgan	708	955	247	35
Moultrie	88	161	73	83
Ogle	386	723	337	87
Peoria	6,157	9,252	3,095	50
Perry	385	607	222	58
Piatt	194	204	10	5
Pike	503	477	−26	−5
Pope	162	193	31	19
Pulaski	902	800	−102	−11
Putnam	20	52	32	160
Randolph	425	657	232	55
Richland	176	229	53	30
Rock Island	3,828	6,397	2,569	67
Saline	707	849	142	20
Sangamon	4,010	5,496	1,486	37
Schuyler	61	183	122	200
Scott	53	123	70	132
Shelby	306	412	106	35
St. Clair	24,030	22,750	−1,280	−5
Stark	43	121	78	181
Stephenson	435	882	447	103
Tazewell	1,713	3,580	1,867	109
Union	422	579	157	37
Vermilion	2,554	3,470	916	36
Wabash	223	360	137	61
Warren	437	613	176	40
Washington	113	160	47	42
Wayne	363	372	9	2
White	390	451	61	16

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Whiteside	800	1,571	771	96
Will	7,012	9,271	2,259	32
Williamson	1,010	1,557	547	54
Winnebago	6,027	8,556	2,529	42
Woodford	221	568	347	157
Total	478,867	499,246	20,379	4
Indiana:				
Adams	132	259	127	96
Allen	6,300	5,961	–339	–5
Bartholomew	1,246	1,239	–7	–1
Benton	91	90	–1	–1
Blackford	125	168	43	34
Boone	239	255	16	7
Brown	165	178	13	8
Carroll	140	206	66	47
Cass	369	699	330	89
Clark	1,964	1,704	–260	–13
Clay	182	339	157	86
Clinton	270	549	279	103
Crawford	184	157	–27	–15
Daviess	300	380	80	27
De Kalb	222	222	0	0
Dearborn	446	632	186	42
Decatur	203	315	112	55
Delaware	3,042	3,054	12	0
Dubois	177	142	–35	–20
Elkhart	1,751	1,357	–394	–23
Fayette	276	680	404	146
Floyd	1,330	1,441	111	8
Fountain	71	171	100	141
Franklin	113	222	109	96
Fulton	118	150	32	27
Gibson	384	372	–12	–3
Grant	1,342	1,868	526	39
Greene	161	178	17	11
Hamilton	415	416	1	0
Hancock	300	350	50	17
Harrison	141	305	164	116
Hendricks	269	321	52	19
Henry	919	897	–22	–2
Howard	1,096	1,994	898	82
Huntington	114	360	246	216
Jackson	539	653	114	21
Jasper	143	234	91	64
Jay	262	289	27	10
Jefferson	370	331	–39	–11
Jennings	258	363	105	41
Johnson	607	661	54	9
Knox	837	817	–20	–2

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Kosciusko	324	437	113	35
LaGrange	129	57	−72	−56
Lake	23,633	25,936	2,303	10
La Porte	2,052	2,341	289	14
Lawrence	292	360	68	23
Madison	2,361	3,353	992	42
Marion	25,346	22,220	−3,126	−12
Marshall	306	209	−97	−32
Martin	151	206	55	36
Miami	300	466	166	55
Monroe	904	984	80	9
Montgomery	176	224	48	27
Morgan	823	638	−185	−22
Newton	110	157	47	43
Noble	155	272	117	75
Ohio	34	54	20	59
Orange	140	261	121	86
Owen	122	138	16	13
Parke	178	220	42	24
Perry	173	277	104	60
Pike	123	136	13	11
Porter	789	1,045	256	32
Posey	329	365	36	11
Pulaski	59	124	65	110
Putnam	137	182	45	33
Randolph	286	429	143	50
Ripley	190	324	134	71
Rush	133	166	33	25
Scott	442	636	194	44
Shelby	329	314	−15	−5
Spencer	152	151	−1	−1
St. Joseph	5,678	5,781	103	2
Starke	281	416	135	48
Steuben	118	86	−32	−27
Sullivan	230	175	−55	−24
Switzerland	87	104	17	20
Tippecanoe	945	982	37	4
Tipton	100	127	27	27
Union	77	109	32	42
Vanderburgh	4,445	3,834	−611	−14
Vermillion	193	254	61	32
Vigo	1,659	1,884	225	14
Wabash	275	402	127	46
Warren	50	85	35	70
Warrick	345	352	7	2
Washington	198	462	264	133
Wayne	2,223	2,284	61	3
Wells	151	256	105	70
White	148	137	−11	−7
Whitley	59	122	63	107

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Total	105,553	111,513	5,960	6
Iowa:				
Adair	120	144	24	20
Adams	73	69	−4	−5
Allamakee	253	238	−15	−6
Appanoose	692	815	123	18
Audubon	117	70	−47	−40
Benton	320	469	149	47
Black Hawk	4,705	5,632	927	20
Boone	459	575	116	25
Bremer	280	404	124	44
Buchanan	459	664	205	45
Buena Vista	280	322	42	15
Butler	285	276	−9	−3
Calhoun	206	204	−2	−1
Carroll	207	224	17	8
Cass	233	262	29	12
Cedar	246	226	−20	−8
Cerro Gordo	957	1,040	83	9
Cherokee	227	218	−9	−4
Chickasaw	177	245	68	38
Clarke	149	220	71	48
Clay	284	370	86	30
Clayton	294	304	10	3
Clinton	1,057	1,688	631	60
Crawford	271	282	11	4
Dallas	461	671	210	46
Davis	190	255	65	34
Decatur	211	209	−2	−1
Delaware	385	417	32	8
Des Moines	1,072	1,396	324	30
Dickinson	215	234	19	9
Dubuque	1,778	2,432	654	37
Emmet	225	321	96	43
Fayette	416	507	91	22
Floyd	371	492	121	33
Franklin	197	208	11	6
Fremont	162	186	24	15
Greene	210	211	1	0
Grundy	123	150	27	22
Guthrie	263	270	7	3
Hamilton	295	315	20	7
Hancock	171	153	−18	−11
Hardin	341	339	−2	−1
Harrison	477	409	−68	−14
Henry	307	389	82	27
Howard	122	178	56	46
Humboldt	156	147	−9	−6
Ida	84	72	−12	−14

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Iowa	145	119	−26	−18
Jackson	349	637	288	83
Jasper	739	821	82	11
Jefferson	404	360	−44	−11
Johnson	625	761	136	22
Jones	320	378	58	18
Keokuk	186	236	50	27
Kossuth	266	231	−35	−13
Lee	1,132	1,481	349	31
Linn	3,845	4,366	521	14
Louisa	332	427	95	29
Lucas	286	347	61	21
Lyon	74	124	50	68
Madison	211	223	12	6
Mahaska	499	571	72	14
Marion	505	607	102	20
Marshall	914	935	21	2
Mills	238	277	39	16
Mitchell	123	108	−15	−12
Monona	248	267	19	8
Monroe	175	241	66	38
Montgomery	288	247	−41	−14
Muscatine	1,035	1,292	257	25
O'Brien	175	148	−27	−15
Osceola	91	75	−16	−18
Page	387	422	35	9
Palo Alto	217	183	−34	−16
Plymouth	233	233	0	0
Pocahontas	178	151	−27	−15
Polk	9,508	10,215	707	7
Pottawattamie	3,306	2,874	−432	−13
Poweshiek	219	316	97	44
Ringgold	140	122	−18	−13
Sac	157	204	47	30
Scott	4,776	6,304	1,528	32
Shelby	133	160	27	20
Sioux	207	164	−43	−21
Story	475	568	93	20
Tama	381	371	−10	−3
Taylor	178	215	37	21
Union	286	405	119	42
Van Buren	173	217	44	25
Wapello	1,196	1,475	279	23
Warren	465	629	164	35
Washington	278	305	27	10
Wayne	171	216	45	26
Webster	1,401	1,396	−5	−0
Winnebago	148	116	−32	−22
Winneshiek	132	240	108	82
Woodbury	3,570	3,617	47	1

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Worth	148	157	9	6
Wright	309	278	−31	−10
Total	62,560	71,754	9,194	15
Kansas:				
Allen	238	227	−11	−5
Anderson	81	91	10	12
Atchison	343	494	151	44
Barber	32	24	−8	−25
Barton	280	352	72	26
Bourbon	298	326	28	9
Brown	228	280	52	23
Butler	635	702	67	11
Chase	36	28	−8	−22
Chautauqua	80	101	21	26
Cherokee	646	875	229	35
Cheyenne	21	22	1	5
Clark	25	12	−13	−52
Clay	152	118	−34	−22
Cloud	156	124	−32	−21
Coffey	112	78	−34	−30
Comanche	18	7	−11	−61
Cowley	636	693	57	9
Crawford	824	962	138	17
Decatur	27	10	−17	−63
Dickinson	378	23	−355	−94
Doniphan	248	231	−17	−7
Douglas	886	989	103	12
Edwards	53	23	−30	−57
Elk	47	80	33	70
Ellis	220	120	−100	−45
Ellsworth	69	25	−44	−64
Finney	428	315	−113	−26
Ford	461	466	5	1
Franklin	330	490	160	48
Geary	1,210	844	−366	−30
Gove	13	9	−4	−31
Graham	29	19	−10	−34
Grant	139	121	−18	−13
Gray	39	50	11	28
Greeley	28	15	−13	−46
Greenwood	162	135	−27	−17
Hamilton	24	32	8	33
Harper	77	57	−20	−26
Harvey	449	518	69	15
Haskell	42	30	−12	−29
Hodgeman	18	10	−8	−44
Jackson	194	243	49	25
Jefferson	157	160	3	2
Jewell	35	24	−11	−31

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Johnson	2,047	1,213	-834	-41
Kearny	45	51	6	13
Kingman	90	64	-26	-29
Kiowa	23	32	9	39
Labette	687	1,018	331	48
Lane	18	19	1	6
Leavenworth	985	981	-4	-0
Lincoln	23	34	11	48
Linn	113	131	18	16
Logan	22	34	12	55
Lyon	363	305	-58	-16
Marion	95	71	-24	-25
Marshall	143	110	-33	-23
McPherson	172	189	17	10
Meade	32	21	-11	-34
Miami	275	308	33	12
Mitchell	76	59	-17	-22
Montgomery	987	1,207	220	22
Morris	82	91	9	11
Morton	62	67	5	8
Nemaha	93	87	-6	-6
Neosho	309	292	-17	-6
Ness	22	11	-11	-50
Norton	50	27	-23	-46
Osage	201	242	41	20
Osborne	89	51	-38	-43
Ottawa	58	62	4	7
Pawnee	72	66	-6	-8
Phillips	66	38	-28	-42
Pottawatomie	220	179	-41	-19
Pratt	110	51	-59	-54
Rawlins	31	16	-15	-48
Reno	877	1,314	437	50
Republic	60	50	-10	-17
Rice	145	164	19	13
Riley	538	452	-86	-16
Rooks	41	55	14	34
Rush	35	36	1	3
Russell	108	65	-43	-40
Saline	864	919	55	6
Scott	37	15	-22	-59
Sedgwick	9,813	11,027	1,214	12
Seward	367	264	-103	-28
Shawnee	4,037	4,084	47	1
Sheridan	10	8	-2	-20
Sherman	186	144	-42	-23
Smith	41	35	-6	-15
Stafford	40	45	5	13
Stanton	25	27	2	8
Stevens	52	54	2	4

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Sumner	291	344	53	18
Thomas	65	58	−7	−11
Trego	30	17	−13	−43
Wabaunsee	57	69	12	21
Wallace	4	23	19	475
Washington	75	55	−20	−27
Wichita	77	65	−12	−16
Wilson	226	229	3	1
Woodson	23	30	7	30
Wyandotte	10,132	10,032	−100	−1
Total	46,521	47,362	841	2
Kentucky:				
Adair	496	428	−68	−14
Allen	212	242	30	14
Anderson	198	178	−20	−10
Ballard	182	119	−63	−35
Barren	712	637	−75	−11
Bath	367	367	0	0
Bell	2,092	1,741	−351	−17
Boone	707	555	−152	−21
Bourbon	632	455	−177	−28
Boyd	1,269	1,226	−43	−3
Boyle	563	519	−44	−8
Bracken	164	136	−28	−17
Breathitt	1,211	1,099	−112	−9
Breckinridge	622	493	−129	−21
Bullitt	777	818	41	5
Butler	261	209	−52	−20
Caldwell	234	288	54	23
Calloway	265	292	27	10
Campbell	2,508	2,307	−201	−8
Carlisle	119	106	−13	−11
Carroll	330	375	45	14
Carter	808	819	11	1
Casey	560	432	−128	−23
Christian	2,660	2,282	−378	−14
Clark	919	648	−271	−29
Clay	1,873	1,647	−226	−12
Clinton	365	288	−77	−21
Crittenden	126	165	39	31
Cumberland	285	218	−67	−24
Daviess	2,144	1,589	−555	−26
Edmonson	230	195	−35	−15
Elliott	269	259	−10	−4
Estill	684	627	−57	−8
Fayette	6,081	4,314	−1,767	−29
Fleming	291	226	−65	−22
Floyd	1,616	1,401	−215	−13
Franklin	910	747	−163	−18

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Fulton	626	492	−134	−21
Gallatin	109	143	34	31
Garrard	192	191	−1	−1
Grant	234	357	123	53
Graves	659	569	−90	−14
Grayson	556	507	−49	−9
Green	190	195	5	3
Greenup	948	753	−195	−21
Hancock	128	108	−20	−16
Hardin	1,440	1,145	−295	−20
Harlan	2,095	1,681	−414	−20
Harrison	421	381	−40	−10
Hart	616	559	−57	−9
Henderson	1,059	906	−153	−14
Henry	318	379	61	19
Hickman	225	148	−77	−34
Hopkins	869	944	75	9
Jackson	614	543	−71	−12
Jefferson	27,200	22,527	−4,673	−17
Jessamine	614	436	−178	−29
Johnson	929	836	−93	−10
Kenton	4,025	3,902	−123	−3
Knott	1,082	1,025	−57	−5
Knox	2,018	1,869	−149	−7
Larue	243	268	25	10
Laurel	1,261	1,271	10	1
Lawrence	603	639	36	6
Lee	483	376	−107	−22
Leslie	985	702	−283	−29
Letcher	1,278	1,188	−90	−7
Lewis	580	481	−99	−17
Lincoln	776	563	−213	−27
Livingston	134	135	1	1
Logan	759	602	−157	−21
Lyon	57	59	2	4
Madison	1,404	1,232	−172	−12
Magoffin	969	916	−53	−5
Marion	753	636	−117	−16
Marshall	207	272	65	31
Martin	615	573	−42	−7
Mason	403	397	−6	−1
McCracken	1,933	1,797	−136	−7
McCreary	906	950	44	5
McLean	191	203	12	6
Meade	336	286	−50	−15
Menifee	184	183	−1	−1
Mercer	341	256	−85	−25
Metcalfe	177	224	47	27
Monroe	443	353	−90	−20
Montgomery	694	608	−86	−12

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Morgan	530	425	–105	–20
Muhlenberg	804	708	–96	–12
Nelson	741	689	–52	–7
Nicholas	134	133	–1	–1
Ohio	475	547	72	15
Oldham	231	241	10	4
Owen	265	214	–51	–19
Owsley	472	393	–79	–17
Pendleton	254	276	22	9
Perry	1,262	1,169	–93	–7
Pike	1,945	1,867	–78	–4
Powell	589	529	–60	–10
Pulaski	1,231	1,229	–2	–0
Robertson	42	48	6	14
Rockcastle	609	581	–28	–5
Rowan	557	461	–96	–17
Russell	516	420	–96	–19
Scott	534	365	–169	–32
Shelby	500	554	54	11
Simpson	546	384	–162	–30
Spencer	145	123	–22	–15
Taylor	413	498	85	21
Todd	368	255	–113	–31
Trigg	213	203	–10	–5
Trimble	85	107	22	26
Union	308	267	–41	–13
Warren	1,254	1,296	42	3
Washington	328	254	–74	–23
Wayne	761	708	–53	–7
Webster	335	296	–39	–12
Whitley	1,388	1,283	–105	–8
Wolfe	474	484	10	2
Woodford	359	293	–66	–18
Total	116,292	101,513	–14,779	–13
Louisiana:				
Acadia	1,843	2,113	270	15
Allen	741	817	76	10
Ascension	1,521	1,803	282	19
Assumption	685	820	135	20
Avoyelles	1,637	1,743	106	6
Beauregard	574	596	22	4
Bienville	500	588	88	18
Bossier	1,019	1,565	546	54
Caddo	7,516	9,180	1,664	22
Calcasieu	3,624	4,135	511	14
Caldwell	320	221	–99	–31
Cameron	29	81	52	179
Catahoula	480	504	24	5
Claiborne	759	832	73	10

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Concordia	1,219	1,335	116	10
De Soto	972	1,178	206	21
East Baton Rouge	10,154	10,118	−36	−0
East Carroll	1,566	1,405	−161	−10
East Feliciana	987	883	−104	−11
Evangeline	1,999	1,837	−162	−8
Franklin	1,553	1,243	−310	−20
Grant	390	371	−19	−5
Iberia	1,773	2,205	432	24
Iberville	1,772	1,854	82	5
Jackson	768	605	−163	−21
Jefferson	9,004	8,939	−65	−1
Jefferson Davis	720	731	11	2
La Salle	309	276	−33	−11
Lafayette	3,341	2,890	−451	−13
Lafourche	1,167	2,023	856	73
Lincoln	1,022	1,130	108	11
Livingston	718	866	148	21
Madison	1,734	1,573	−161	−9
Morehouse	2,374	2,259	−115	−5
Natchitoches	1,262	1,624	362	29
Orleans	42,322	40,491	−1,831	−4
Ouachita	4,808	5,334	526	11
Plaquemines	555	546	−9	−2
Pointe Coupee	1,327	1,266	−61	−5
Rapides	3,878	3,838	−40	−1
Red River	498	509	11	2
Richland	1,141	1,249	108	9
Sabine	594	726	132	22
St. Bernard	720	824	104	14
St. Charles	1,230	1,185	−45	−4
St. Helena	687	528	−159	−23
St. John The Baptist	1,841	1,413	−428	−23
St. Landry	4,799	4,406	−393	−8
St. Martin	1,318	1,208	−110	−8
St. Mary	1,994	2,441	447	22
St. Tammany	1,702	1,504	−198	−12
Tangipahoa	4,274	5,165	891	21
Tensas	815	709	−106	−13
Terrebonne	1,840	2,412	572	31
Union	458	572	114	25
Vermilion	836	1,272	436	52
Vernon	763	690	−73	−10
Washington	1,870	1,885	15	1
Webster	1,133	1,195	62	5
West Baton Rouge	837	771	−66	−8
West Carroll	402	468	66	16
West Feliciana	403	315	−88	−22
Winn	680	753	73	11
Total	149,777	154,018	4,241	3

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Maine:				
Androscoggin	4,039	3,294	–745	–18
Aroostook	3,446	2,616	–830	–24
Cumberland	7,856	5,577	–2,279	–29
Franklin	875	801	–74	–8
Hancock	1,201	1,117	–84	–7
Kennebec	3,636	3,302	–334	–9
Knox	1,209	881	–328	–27
Lincoln	733	568	–165	–23
Oxford	1,890	1,507	–383	–20
Penobscot	4,635	3,912	–723	–16
Piscataquis	613	472	–141	–23
Sagadahoc	806	650	–156	–19
Somerset	2,043	1,795	–248	–12
Waldo	1,290	1,021	–269	–21
Washington	1,584	1,541	–43	–3
York	4,450	3,417	–1,033	–23
Total	40,306	32,471	–7,835	–19
Maryland:				
Allegany	1,514	2,395	881	58
Anne Arundel	6,503	5,119	–1,384	–21
Baltimore	6,124	6,831	707	12
Baltimore City	89,741	74,097	–15,644	–17
Calvert	1,206	857	–349	–29
Caroline	714	531	–183	–26
Carroll	847	728	–119	–14
Cecil	1,328	1,469	141	11
Charles	1,943	1,835	–108	–6
Dorchester	1,105	1,059	–46	–4
Frederick	980	1,146	166	17
Garrett	578	689	111	19
Harford	3,063	2,320	–743	–24
Howard	529	542	13	2
Kent	327	312	–15	–5
Montgomery	5,420	4,943	–477	–9
Prince George's	13,643	12,922	–721	–5
Queen Anne's	509	537	28	6
Somerset	547	659	112	20
St. Mary's	1,543	1,228	–315	–20
Talbot	405	379	–26	–6
Washington	1,285	1,993	708	55
Wicomico	1,911	1,105	–806	–42
Worcester	477	672	195	41
Total	142,242	124,368	–17,874	–13
Massachusetts:				
Barnstable	4,546	2,612	–1,934	–43
Berkshire	5,109	3,989	–1,120	–22
Bristol	22,039	15,349	–6,690	–30

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Dukes	171	79	−92	−54
Essex	29,663	20,894	−8,769	−30
Franklin	1,859	2,615	756	41
Hampden	27,651	23,731	−3,920	−14
Hampshire	2,287	1,208	−1,079	−47
Middlesex	27,980	18,919	−9,061	−32
Nantucket	84	22	−62	−74
Norfolk	10,808	5,241	−5,567	−52
Plymouth	16,776	9,886	−6,890	−41
Suffolk	61,408	35,539	−25,869	−42
Worcester	25,453	18,205	−7,248	−28
Total	235,834	158,289	−77,545	−33
Michigan:				
Alcona	335	433	98	29
Alger	381	323	−58	−15
Allegan	2,639	2,412	−227	−9
Alpena	1,202	1,693	491	41
Antrim	455	653	198	44
Arenac	711	1,024	313	44
Baraga	332	528	196	59
Barry	1,411	1,530	119	8
Bay	4,339	5,849	1,510	35
Benzie	397	506	109	27
Berrien	11,108	10,695	−413	−4
Branch	1,260	1,710	450	36
Calhoun	7,855	8,505	650	8
Cass	1,827	2,031	204	11
Charlevoix	526	725	199	38
Cheboygan	806	1,012	206	26
Chippewa	1,252	1,381	129	10
Clare	1,327	1,926	599	45
Clinton	1,067	1,142	75	7
Crawford	463	689	226	49
Delta	1,195	1,526	331	28
Dickinson	522	764	242	46
Eaton	1,549	1,972	423	27
Emmet	533	660	127	24
Genesee	25,705	30,752	5,047	20
Gladwin	939	1,418	479	51
Gogebic	739	750	11	1
Grand Traverse	1,155	1,327	172	15
Gratiot	1,394	1,592	198	14
Hillsdale	1,297	1,827	530	41
Houghton	1,420	1,360	−60	−4
Huron	788	1,160	372	47
Ingham	12,973	11,928	−1,045	−8
Ionia	1,813	1,951	138	8
Iosco	901	1,074	173	19
Iron	413	379	−34	−8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Isabella	1,821	1,751	−70	−4
Jackson	5,689	6,624	935	16
Kalamazoo	8,171	8,221	50	1
Kalkaska	557	729	172	31
Kent	16,326	15,583	−743	−5
Keweenaw	64	63	−1	−2
Lake	576	759	183	32
Lapeer	1,869	2,681	812	43
Leelanau	209	172	−37	−18
Lenawee	2,823	3,600	777	28
Livingston	1,736	2,269	533	31
Luce	235	395	160	68
Mackinac	438	357	−81	−18
Macomb	13,902	15,363	1,461	11
Manistee	615	1,049	434	71
Marquette	1,974	2,197	223	11
Mason	761	1,044	283	37
Mecosta	1,155	1,178	23	2
Menominee	762	927	165	22
Midland	2,343	2,220	−123	−5
Missaukee	415	434	19	5
Monroe	3,654	5,241	1,587	43
Montcalm	1,650	1,905	255	15
Montmorency	318	519	201	63
Muskegon	9,836	10,356	520	5
Newaygo	1,605	1,858	253	16
Oakland	21,444	25,699	4,255	20
Oceana	1,067	1,241	174	16
Ogemaw	840	1,179	339	40
Ontonagon	396	443	47	12
Osceola	801	945	144	18
Oscoda	275	340	65	24
Otsego	287	522	235	82
Ottawa	2,183	2,221	38	2
Presque Isle	333	376	43	13
Roscommon	637	1,103	466	73
Saginaw	14,351	16,521	2,170	15
Sanilac	1,494	1,831	337	23
Schoolcraft	339	338	−1	−0
Shiawassee	2,285	3,132	847	37
St. Clair	6,122	6,969	847	14
St. Joseph	2,040	1,936	−104	−5
Tuscola	1,932	2,310	378	20
Van Buren	4,458	3,945	−513	−12
Washtenaw	7,007	7,208	201	3
Wayne	188,941	209,163	20,222	11
Wexford	1,000	1,179	179	18
Total	430,765	481,303	50,538	12

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Minnesota:				
Aitkin	303	503	200	66
Anoka	4,194	3,684	–510	–12
Becker	735	944	209	28
Beltrami	1,380	1,741	361	26
Benton	333	504	171	51
Big Stone	98	126	28	29
Blue Earth	870	1,045	175	20
Brown	337	317	–20	–6
Carlton	760	1,031	271	36
Carver	414	231	–183	–44
Cass	839	1,140	301	36
Chippewa	201	126	–75	–37
Chisago	451	538	87	19
Clay	687	972	285	41
Clearwater	397	472	75	19
Cook	69	87	18	26
Cottonwood	179	165	–14	–8
Crow Wing	834	1,486	652	78
Dakota	2,950	2,879	–71	–2
Dodge	180	239	59	33
Douglas	391	395	4	1
Fillmore	188	294	106	56
Freeborn	478	694	216	45
Goodhue	466	575	109	23
Grant	65	77	12	18
Hennepin	26,885	23,950	–2,935	–11
Houston	200	255	55	27
Hubbard	437	502	65	15
Isanti	357	542	185	52
Itasca	1,398	1,889	491	35
Jackson	156	213	57	37
Kanabec	272	324	52	19
Kandiyohi	520	837	317	61
Kittson	65	71	6	9
Koochiching	500	523	23	5
Lac qui Parle	68	73	5	7
Lake	195	310	115	59
Lake Of The Woods	56	73	17	30
Le Sueur	292	380	88	30
Lincoln	528	768	240	45
Mahnomen	170	249	79	46
Marshall	136	123	–13	–10
Martin	621	989	368	59
McLeod	317	299	–18	–6
Meeker	268	379	111	41
Mille Lacs	468	579	111	24
Morrison	614	740	126	21
Mower	632	901	269	43
Nicollet	296	301	5	2

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Nobles	314	327	13	4
Norman	76	96	20	26
Olmsted	1,175	1,203	28	2
Otter Tail	563	682	119	21
Pennington	212	307	95	45
Pine	556	753	197	35
Pipestone	115	164	49	43
Polk	729	977	248	34
Pope	143	215	72	50
Ramsey	15,109	14,604	−505	−3
Red Lake	37	59	22	59
Redwood	198	248	50	25
Renville	187	141	−46	−25
Rice	620	632	12	2
Rock	80	101	21	26
Roseau	146	188	42	29
Scott	554	507	−47	−8
Sherburne	542	662	120	22
Sibley	115	165	50	43
St. Louis	6,279	8,497	2,218	35
Stearns	1,356	1,570	214	16
Steele	243	309	66	27
Stevens	87	108	21	24
Swift	242	213	−29	−12
Todd	405	599	194	48
Traverse	60	50	−10	−17
Wabasha	224	294	70	31
Wadena	283	462	179	63
Waseca	234	304	70	30
Washington	1,588	1,480	−108	−7
Wilkin	100	118	18	18
Winona	783	768	−15	−2
Wright	1,042	1,219	177	17
Yellow Medicine	133	170	37	28
Total	87,780	93,727	5,947	7
Mississippi:				
Adams	2,677	1,932	−745	−28
Alcorn	529	543	14	3
Amite	477	521	44	9
Attala	830	548	−282	−34
Benton	439	368	−71	−16
Bolivar	5,291	4,960	−331	−6
Calhoun	601	425	−176	−29
Carroll	516	378	−138	−27
Chickasaw	609	386	−223	−37
Choctaw	443	370	−73	−16
Claiborne	907	1,032	125	14
Clarke	619	616	−3	−0
Clay	1,324	1,160	−164	−12

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Coahoma	4,134	3,985	−149	−4
Copiah	1,638	1,436	−202	−12
Covington	946	826	−120	−13
De Soto	1,299	1,079	−220	−17
Forrest	2,257	1,908	−349	−15
Franklin	388	414	26	7
George	361	442	81	22
Greene	252	364	112	44
Grenada	1,240	878	−362	−29
Hancock	742	688	−54	−7
Harrison	4,680	3,605	−1,075	−23
Hinds	14,786	10,263	−4,523	−31
Holmes	3,954	3,289	−665	−17
Humphreys	1,750	1,356	−394	−23
Issaquena	262	211	−51	−19
Itawamba	142	209	67	47
Jackson	1,621	3,019	1,398	86
Jasper	854	750	−104	−12
Jefferson	1,133	799	−334	−29
Jefferson Davis	1,052	880	−172	−16
Jones	1,923	1,647	−276	−14
Kemper	454	418	−36	−8
Lafayette	768	592	−176	−23
Lamar	617	634	17	3
Lauderdale	3,711	2,994	−717	−19
Lawrence	447	506	59	13
Leake	783	600	−183	−23
Lee	1,207	883	−324	−27
Leflore	3,691	3,044	−647	−18
Lincoln	1,177	1,119	−58	−5
Lowndes	2,845	2,305	−540	−19
Madison	3,480	2,797	−683	−20
Marion	1,006	1,127	121	12
Marshall	2,446	1,599	−847	−35
Monroe	1,264	1,132	−132	−10
Montgomery	1,096	866	−230	−21
Neshoba	908	793	−115	−13
Newton	551	490	−61	−11
Noxubee	1,357	1,405	48	4
Oktibbeha	1,837	1,594	−243	−13
Panola	1,945	1,650	−295	−15
Pearl River	1,122	1,126	4	0
Perry	538	465	−73	−14
Pike	2,277	1,836	−441	−19
Pontotoc	447	363	−84	−19
Prentiss	427	358	−69	−16
Quitman	1,046	1,218	172	16
Rankin	556	712	156	28
Scott	827	818	−9	−1
Sharkey	1,135	840	−295	−26

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Simpson	634	577	−57	−9
Smith	379	237	−142	−37
Stone	308	307	−1	−0
Sunflower	3,114	2,741	−373	−12
Tallahatchie	1,997	1,620	−377	−19
Tate	1,324	1,037	−287	−22
Tippah	614	350	−264	−43
Tishomingo	145	147	2	1
Tunica	1,437	1,478	41	3
Union	441	385	−56	−13
Walthall	1,092	1,026	−66	−6
Warren	2,811	2,187	−624	−22
Washington	6,597	6,344	−253	−4
Wayne	1,159	1,191	32	3
Webster	388	358	−30	−8
Wilkinson	847	777	−70	−8
Winston	1,046	1,058	12	1
Yalobusha	534	386	−148	−28
Yazoo	2,567	1,945	−622	−24
Total	128,075	109,722	−18,353	−14
Missouri:				
Adair	260	370	110	42
Andrew	102	216	114	112
Atchison	76	65	−11	−14
Audrain	350	480	130	37
Barry	380	451	71	19
Barton	90	194	104	116
Bates	240	390	150	63
Benton	187	232	45	24
Bollinger	227	275	48	21
Boone	1,165	1,394	229	20
Buchanan	1,969	2,502	533	27
Butler	1,570	1,748	178	11
Caldwell	87	96	9	10
Callaway	402	451	49	12
Camden	271	285	14	5
Cape Girardeau	834	966	132	16
Carroll	233	320	87	37
Carter	155	253	98	63
Cass	473	659	186	39
Cedar	176	216	40	23
Chariton	187	146	−41	−22
Christian	317	349	32	10
Clark	123	225	102	83
Clay	979	1,187	208	21
Clinton	164	182	18	11
Cole	426	600	174	41
Cooper	197	198	1	1
Crawford	425	599	174	41

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Dade	74	100	26	35
Dallas	185	232	47	25
Daviess	108	147	39	36
De Kalb	59	110	51	86
Dent	389	515	126	32
Douglas	178	306	128	72
Dunklin	2,124	2,370	246	12
Franklin	917	1,242	325	35
Gasconade	98	100	2	2
Gentry	65	148	83	128
Greene	3,647	3,565	−82	−2
Grundy	126	195	69	55
Harrison	127	179	52	41
Henry	328	407	79	24
Hickory	124	189	65	52
Holt	94	98	4	4
Howard	250	172	−78	−31
Howell	531	801	270	51
Iron	266	334	68	26
Jackson	22,050	19,016	−3,034	−14
Jasper	1,612	1,817	205	13
Jefferson	1,587	1,905	318	20
Johnson	368	443	75	20
Knox	48	61	13	27
Laclede	549	571	22	4
Lafayette	344	390	46	13
Lawrence	415	518	103	25
Lewis	159	266	107	67
Lincoln	219	247	28	13
Linn	249	272	23	9
Livingston	222	291	69	31
Macon	126	129	3	2
Madison	258	362	104	40
Maries	109	112	3	3
Marion	560	821	261	47
McDonald	345	399	54	16
Mercer	49	37	−12	−24
Miller	291	314	23	8
Mississippi	1,441	1,345	−96	−7
Moniteau	111	143	32	29
Monroe	121	92	−29	−24
Montgomery	198	192	−6	−3
Morgan	166	279	113	68
New Madrid	1,862	1,751	−111	−6
Newton	503	637	134	27
Nodaway	182	220	38	21
Oregon	225	259	34	15
Osage	70	72	2	3
Ozark	157	222	65	41
Pemiscot	2,844	2,619	−225	−8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Perry	170	263	93	55
Pettis	788	776	−12	−2
Phelps	523	561	38	7
Pike	348	497	149	43
Platte	348	420	72	21
Polk	246	287	41	17
Pulaski	540	655	115	21
Putnam	42	64	22	52
Ralls	73	138	65	89
Randolph	402	603	201	50
Ray	256	390	134	52
Reynolds	148	216	68	46
Ripley	485	753	268	55
Saline	390	484	94	24
Schuyler	67	103	36	54
Scotland	23	93	70	304
Scott	1,616	1,939	323	20
Shannon	199	176	−23	−12
Shelby	89	116	27	30
St. Charles	1,207	1,239	32	3
St. Clair	216	308	92	43
St. Francois	1,022	1,527	505	49
St. Louis	12,827	12,643	−184	−1
St. Louis City	47,345	39,106	−8,239	−17
Ste. Genevieve	176	237	61	35
Stoddard	760	973	213	28
Stone	161	254	93	58
Sullivan	125	89	−36	−29
Taney	296	273	−23	−8
Texas	389	457	68	17
Vernon	391	432	41	10
Warren	182	220	38	21
Washington	764	1,177	413	54
Wayne	317	463	146	46
Webster	234	222	−12	−5
Worth	50	62	12	24
Wright	322	441	119	37
Total	132,732	130,718	−2,014	−1
Montana:				
Beaverhead	107	120	13	12
Big Horn	256	397	141	55
Blaine	291	283	−8	−3
Broadwater	30	24	−6	−20
Carbon	75	101	26	35
Carter	7	4	−3	−43
Cascade	1,517	1,527	10	1
Chouteau	25	34	9	36
Custer	137	207	70	51
Daniels	13	1	−12	−92

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Dawson	89	87	−2	−2
Deer Lodge	265	276	11	4
Fallon	32	15	−17	−53
Fergus	95	91	−4	−4
Flathead	607	983	376	62
Gallatin	225	250	25	11
Garfield	5	4	−1	−20
Glacier	580	603	23	4
Golden Valley	4	7	3	75
Granite	42	69	27	64
Hill	423	486	63	15
Jefferson	60	63	3	5
Judith Basin	21	5	−16	−76
Lake	323	572	249	77
Lewis And Clark	662	690	28	4
Liberty	8	6	−2	−25
Lincoln	403	401	−2	−0
Madison	29	40	11	38
McCone	0	5	5	
Meagher	22	22	0	0
Mineral	50	68	18	36
Missoula	1,236	1,215	−21	−2
Musselshell	73	56	−17	−23
Park	148	195	47	32
Petroleum	5	2	−3	−60
Phillips	42	55	13	31
Pondera	165	128	−37	−22
Powder River	7	18	11	157
Powell	102	135	33	32
Prairie	3	7	4	133
Ravalli	276	320	44	16
Richland	113	148	35	31
Roosevelt	309	379	70	23
Rosebud	298	279	−19	−6
Sanders	154	130	−24	−16
Sheridan	29	42	13	45
Silver Bow	840	880	40	5
Stillwater	50	44	−6	−12
Sweet Grass	18	27	9	50
Teton	66	41	−25	−38
Toole	74	56	−18	−24
Treasure	10	2	−8	−80
Valley	229	154	−75	−33
Wheatland	26	14	−12	−46
Wibaux	18	21	3	17
Yellowstone	1,692	1,420	−272	−16
Yellowstone National Park	10	0	−10	−100
Total	12,396	13,209	813	7

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Nebraska:				
Adams	289	442	153	53
Antelope	33	56	23	70
Arthur	0	0	0	.
Banner	9	6	−3	−33
Blaine	11	10	−1	−9
Boone	39	43	4	10
Box Butte	130	144	14	11
Boyd	28	12	−16	−57
Brown	19	25	6	32
Buffalo	274	433	159	58
Burt	95	110	15	16
Butler	26	60	34	131
Cass	152	183	31	20
Cedar	57	46	−11	−19
Chase	50	38	−12	−24
Cherry	53	49	−4	−8
Cheyenne	79	61	−18	−23
Clay	109	108	−1	−1
Colfax	47	125	78	166
Cuming	28	61	33	118
Custer	119	145	26	22
Dakota	72	258	186	258
Dawes	111	164	53	48
Dawson	261	271	10	4
Deuel	48	36	−12	−25
Dixon	63	50	−13	−21
Dodge	257	470	213	83
Douglas	13,192	13,363	171	1
Dundy	10	46	36	360
Fillmore	53	63	10	19
Franklin	42	33	−9	−21
Frontier	14	16	2	14
Furnas	40	21	−19	−48
Gage	310	476	166	54
Garden	14	24	10	71
Garfield	34	16	−18	−53
Gosper	20	12	−8	−40
Grant	4	15	11	275
Greeley	32	19	−13	−41
Hall	549	953	404	74
Hamilton	78	108	30	38
Harlan	53	52	−1	−2
Hayes	2	3	1	50
Hitchcock	41	38	−3	−7
Holt	92	140	48	52
Hooker	10	12	2	20
Howard	67	81	14	21
Jefferson	79	126	47	59
Johnson	41	35	−6	−15

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Kearney	22	40	18	82
Keith	126	123	−3	−2
Keya Paha	4	4	0	0
Kimball	52	59	7	13
Knox	76	163	87	114
Lancaster	2,799	3,285	486	17
Lincoln	492	711	219	45
Logan	10	12	2	20
Loup	9	10	1	11
Madison	244	358	114	47
McPherson	7	4	−3	−43
Merrick	84	136	52	62
Morrill	94	121	27	29
Nance	18	23	5	28
Nemaha	96	96	0	0
Nuckolls	45	79	34	76
Otoe	143	200	57	40
Pawnee	22	17	−5	−23
Perkins	22	12	−10	−45
Phelps	86	68	−18	−21
Pierce	33	57	24	73
Platte	114	227	113	99
Polk	19	27	8	42
Red Willow	56	126	70	125
Richardson	143	142	−1	−1
Rock	15	16	1	7
Saline	48	78	30	63
Sarpy	683	735	52	8
Saunders	127	204	77	61
Scotts Bluff	969	1,317	348	36
Seward	103	116	13	13
Sheridan	80	103	23	29
Sherman	23	31	8	35
Sioux	13	3	−10	−77
Stanton	13	35	22	169
Thayer	43	47	4	9
Thomas	2	3	1	50
Thurston	540	757	217	40
Valley	34	32	−2	−6
Washington	100	102	2	2
Wayne	34	47	13	38
Webster	48	70	22	46
Wheeler	4	8	4	100
York	124	143	19	15
Total	25,155	29,005	3,850	15
Nevada:				
Carson City	94	189	95	101
Churchill	105	90	−15	−14
Clark	5,697	6,657	960	17

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Douglas	28	47	19	68
Elko	125	111	−14	−11
Esmeralda	4	10	6	150
Eureka	2	2	0	0
Humboldt	97	107	10	10
Lander	35	49	14	40
Lincoln	32	25	−7	−22
Lyon	85	109	24	28
Mineral	75	69	−6	−8
Nye	10	76	66	660
Pershing	17	19	2	12
Storey	7	4	−3	−43
Washoe	460	930	470	102
White Pine	89	84	−5	−6
Total	6,962	8,578	1,616	23
New Hampshire:				
Belknap	781	788	7	1
Carroll	283	323	40	14
Cheshire	1,012	1,154	142	14
Coos	771	744	−27	−4
Grafton	929	760	−169	−18
Hillsborough	4,416	3,752	−664	−15
Merrimack	1,186	1,133	−53	−4
Rockingham	2,764	1,907	−857	−31
Strafford	1,471	1,576	105	7
Sullivan	551	779	228	41
Total	14,164	12,916	−1,248	−9
New Jersey:				
Atlantic	15,846	7,633	−8,213	−52
Bergen	6,202	4,141	−2,061	−33
Burlington	9,213	7,321	−1,892	−21
Camden	31,431	28,746	−2,685	−9
Cape May	2,327	2,077	−250	−11
Cumberland	8,952	8,404	−548	−6
Essex	82,859	70,670	−12,189	−15
Gloucester	5,849	5,527	−322	−6
Hudson	40,960	34,181	−6,779	−17
Hunterdon	752	398	−354	−47
Mercer	16,887	13,340	−3,547	−21
Middlesex	16,526	11,002	−5,524	−33
Monmouth	16,728	11,631	−5,097	−30
Morris	2,957	1,744	−1,213	−41
Ocean	10,602	7,778	−2,824	−27
Passaic	27,175	21,708	−5,467	−20
Salem	2,669	2,643	−26	−1
Somerset	2,785	1,695	−1,090	−39
Sussex	1,575	967	−608	−39
Union	15,246	13,388	−1,858	−12

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Warren	1,717	1,591	−126	−7
Total	319,258	256,585	−62,673	−20
New Mexico:				
Bernalillo	10,425	9,026	−1,399	−13
Catron	28	37	9	32
Chaves	1,297	1,293	−4	−0
Colfax	389	348	−41	−11
Curry	1,387	1,289	−98	−7
De Baca	40	46	6	15
Dona Ana	2,272	2,631	359	16
Eddy	1,050	897	−153	−15
Grant	610	731	121	20
Guadalupe	232	220	−12	−5
Harding	12	3	−9	−75
Hidalgo	191	210	19	10
Lea	1,332	951	−381	−29
Lincoln	232	99	−133	−57
Los Alamos	15	13	−2	−13
Luna	395	561	166	42
McKinley	3,295	3,455	160	5
Mora	218	178	−40	−18
Otero	766	52	−714	−93
Quay	285	201	−84	−29
Rio Arriba	1,268	1,005	−263	−21
Roosevelt	508	602	94	19
San Juan	2,306	2,337	31	1
San Miguel	1,411	1,169	−242	−17
Sandoval	1,048	993	−55	−5
Santa Fe	1,791	1,169	−622	−35
Sierra	183	211	28	15
Socorro	469	484	15	3
Taos	906	650	−256	−28
Torrance	217	207	−10	−5
Union	98	74	−24	−24
Valencia	1,362	778	−584	−43
Total	36,038	31,920	−4,118	−11
New York:				
Albany	6,754	4,775	−1,979	−29
Allegany	1,642	2,057	415	25
Broome	3,855	3,633	−222	−6
Cattaraugus	1,924	2,418	494	26
Cayuga	1,865	2,285	420	23
Chautauqua	4,590	4,546	−44	−1
Chemung	2,572	3,554	982	38
Chenango	481	885	404	84
Clinton	1,871	1,654	−217	−12
Columbia	952	1,026	74	8
Cortland	1,264	1,429	165	13

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Delaware	812	948	136	17
Dutchess	3,644	3,300	−344	−9
Erie	33,369	37,834	4,465	13
Essex	1,049	1,075	26	2
Franklin	1,473	1,477	4	0
Fulton	1,024	1,010	−14	−1
Genesee	847	904	57	7
Greene	675	838	163	24
Hamilton	88	85	−3	−3
Herkimer	1,017	1,275	258	25
Jefferson	1,982	2,906	924	47
Lewis	395	516	121	31
Livingston	900	793	−107	−12
Madison	1,061	1,109	48	5
Monroe	21,860	23,253	1,393	6
Montgomery	926	1,054	128	14
Nassau	18,000	12,009	−5,991	−33
New York	531,846	497,278	−34,568	−6
Niagara	5,743	7,918	2,175	38
Oneida	6,913	7,983	1,070	15
Onondaga	12,790	12,250	−540	−4
Ontario	1,282	1,243	−39	−3
Orange	8,295	7,730	−565	−7
Orleans	987	1,158	171	17
Oswego	2,748	3,418	670	24
Otsego	920	912	−8	−1
Putnam	565	227	−338	−60
Rensselaer	3,327	2,977	−350	−11
Rockland	4,982	3,535	−1,447	−29
Saratoga	1,870	1,735	−135	−7
Schenectady	3,124	3,509	385	12
Schoharie	484	570	86	18
Schuyler	237	381	144	61
Seneca	334	415	81	24
St. Lawrence	3,382	4,000	618	18
Steuben	2,335	2,967	632	27
Suffolk	27,667	25,401	−2,266	−8
Sullivan	1,620	1,156	−464	−29
Tioga	775	981	206	27
Tompkins	1,499	1,489	−10	−1
Ulster	3,876	2,928	−948	−24
Warren	1,008	894	−114	−11
Washington	1,187	1,065	−122	−10
Wayne	1,525	1,583	58	4
Westchester	24,632	19,153	−5,479	−22
Wyoming	331	369	38	11
Yates	288	421	133	46
Total	773,464	734,294	−39,170	−5

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
North Carolina:				
Alamance	1,262	990	−272	−22
Alexander	198	118	−80	−40
Alleghany	142	92	−50	−35
Anson	535	643	108	20
Ashe	280	216	−64	−23
Avery	91	91	0	0
Beaufort	1,111	827	−284	−26
Bertie	805	679	−126	−16
Bladen	1,397	1,077	−320	−23
Brunswick	685	747	62	9
Buncombe	1,944	1,596	−348	−18
Burke	687	655	−32	−5
Cabarrus	1,286	893	−393	−31
Caldwell	516	623	107	21
Camden	173	99	−74	−43
Carteret	741	395	−346	−47
Caswell	585	487	−98	−17
Catawba	1,093	975	−118	−11
Chatham	353	341	−12	−3
Cherokee	219	178	−41	−19
Chowan	356	253	−103	−29
Clay	52	56	4	8
Cleveland	2,295	1,942	−353	−15
Columbus	1,385	1,731	346	25
Craven	2,044	1,354	−690	−34
Cumberland	8,925	6,952	−1,973	−22
Currituck	155	102	−53	−34
Dare	126	94	−32	−25
Davidson	1,393	1,192	−201	−14
Davie	254	178	−76	−30
Duplin	1,353	994	−359	−27
Durham	5,607	3,123	−2,484	−44
Edgecombe	2,731	2,645	−86	−3
Forsyth	7,296	5,186	−2,110	−29
Franklin	762	728	−34	−4
Gaston	3,346	3,152	−194	−6
Gates	207	224	17	8
Graham	45	99	54	120
Granville	586	670	84	14
Greene	737	565	−172	−23
Guilford	8,172	5,169	−3,003	−37
Halifax	4,094	3,250	−844	−21
Harnett	1,726	1,532	−194	−11
Haywood	533	541	8	2
Henderson	620	570	−50	−8
Hertford	618	757	139	22
Hoke	625	861	236	38
Hyde	146	169	23	16
Iredell	1,162	1,092	−70	−6

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Jackson	234	254	20	9
Johnston	1,170	1,233	63	5
Jones	485	330	−155	−32
Lee	582	694	112	19
Lenoir	2,023	1,654	−369	−18
Lincoln	440	563	123	28
Macon	55	58	3	5
Madison	293	246	−47	−16
Martin	581	760	179	31
McDowell	406	326	−80	−20
Mecklenburg	12,831	8,760	−4,071	−32
Mitchell	175	124	−51	−29
Montgomery	383	334	−49	−13
Moore	883	528	−355	−40
Nash	2,296	1,723	−573	−25
New Hanover	2,825	2,491	−334	−12
Northampton	1,498	1,285	−213	−14
Onslow	1,232	1,009	−223	−18
Orange	772	545	−227	−29
Pamlico	254	206	−48	−19
Pasquotank	725	924	199	27
Pender	689	648	−41	−6
Perquimans	221	290	69	31
Person	781	645	−136	−17
Pitt	3,474	3,071	−403	−12
Polk	120	88	−32	−27
Randolph	385	416	31	8
Richmond	929	774	−155	−17
Robeson	5,611	4,716	−895	−16
Rockingham	1,470	1,328	−142	−10
Rowan	1,149	1,068	−81	−7
Rutherford	883	942	59	7
Sampson	1,292	1,233	−59	−5
Scotland	1,833	1,692	−141	−8
Stanly	573	374	−199	−35
Stokes	343	274	−69	−20
Surry	459	523	64	14
Swain	208	282	74	36
Transylvania	292	231	−61	−21
Tyrrell	165	182	17	10
Union	1,420	1,160	−260	−18
Vance	1,542	1,381	−161	−10
Wake	6,164	3,988	−2,176	−35
Warren	866	697	−169	−20
Washington	542	629	87	16
Watauga	280	217	−63	−23
Wayne	3,175	3,096	−79	−2
Wilkes	362	483	121	33
Wilson	1,920	2,251	331	17
Yadkin	252	195	−57	−23

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Yancey	121	143	22	18
Total	139,118	113,967	−25,151	−18
North Dakota:				
Adams	24	20	−4	−17
Barnes	137	126	−11	−8
Benson	622	435	−187	−30
Billings	6	2	−4	−67
Bottineau	87	120	33	38
Bowman	30	25	−5	−17
Burke	39	28	−11	−28
Burleigh	540	502	−38	−7
Cass	984	740	−244	−25
Cavalier	81	37	−44	−54
Dickey	63	55	−8	−13
Divide	26	14	−12	−46
Dunn	73	56	−17	−23
Eddy	61	46	−15	−25
Emmons	19	24	5	26
Foster	68	58	−10	−15
Golden Valley	16	17	1	6
Grand Forks	594	392	−202	−34
Grant	33	19	−14	−42
Griggs	28	29	1	4
Hettinger	24	33	9	38
Kidder	57	22	−35	−61
La Moure	42	38	−4	−10
Logan	18	15	−3	−17
McHenry	99	63	−36	−36
McIntosh	35	19	−16	−46
McKenzie	120	166	46	38
McLean	219	181	−38	−17
Mercer	64	41	−23	−36
Morton	255	307	52	20
Mountrail	204	210	6	3
Nelson	42	22	−20	−48
Oliver	8	15	7	88
Pembina	202	92	−110	−54
Pierce	73	49	−24	−33
Ramsey	140	141	1	1
Ransom	83	44	−39	−47
Renville	25	8	−17	−68
Richland	141	93	−48	−34
Rolette	1,580	1,307	−273	−17
Sargent	49	48	−1	−2
Sheridan	34	14	−20	−59
Sioux	267	292	25	9
Slope	3	0	−3	−100
Stark	118	204	86	73
Steele	23	16	−7	−30

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Stutsman	309	233	−76	−25
Towner	63	43	−20	−32
Traill	48	49	1	2
Walsh	184	143	−41	−22
Ward	791	607	−184	−23
Wells	55	42	−13	−24
Williams	281	249	−32	−11
Total	9,187	7,551	−1,636	−18
Ohio:				
Adams	1,279	2,065	786	61
Allen	3,172	5,146	1,974	62
Ashland	518	1,032	514	99
Ashtabula	2,538	4,568	2,030	80
Athens	1,763	2,448	685	39
Auglaize	400	1,040	640	160
Belmont	1,692	3,738	2,046	121
Brown	729	1,440	711	98
Butler	7,305	8,678	1,373	19
Carroll	416	988	572	138
Champaign	634	1,045	411	65
Clark	5,513	6,874	1,361	25
Clermont	2,434	4,291	1,857	76
Clinton	676	895	219	32
Columbiana	2,352	4,891	2,539	108
Coshocton	562	886	324	58
Crawford	1,031	1,857	826	80
Cuyahoga	71,285	77,595	6,310	9
Darke	705	1,475	770	109
Defiance	516	1,176	660	128
Delaware	602	845	243	40
Erie	1,554	2,189	635	41
Fairfield	1,161	2,159	998	86
Fayette	639	1,267	628	98
Franklin	36,455	38,363	1,908	5
Fulton	407	663	256	63
Gallia	853	1,774	921	108
Geauga	392	470	78	20
Greene	2,361	3,079	718	30
Guernsey	706	1,812	1,106	157
Hamilton	31,145	37,729	6,584	21
Hancock	704	902	198	28
Hardin	440	1,228	788	179
Harrison	293	754	461	157
Henry	259	444	185	71
Highland	726	1,356	630	87
Hocking	714	1,311	597	84
Holmes	156	282	126	81
Huron	600	1,574	974	162
Jackson	1,566	1,906	340	22

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Jefferson	2,838	4,228	1,390	49
Knox	809	1,186	377	47
Lake	1,812	2,538	726	40
Lawrence	2,772	4,804	2,032	73
Licking	2,544	3,804	1,260	50
Logan	686	1,366	680	99
Lorain	6,269	11,551	5,282	84
Lucas	19,569	24,269	4,700	24
Madison	683	943	260	38
Mahoning	11,699	15,634	3,935	34
Marion	2,054	2,904	850	41
Medina	507	1,360	853	168
Meigs	773	1,493	720	93
Mercer	406	796	390	96
Miami	1,404	2,322	918	65
Monroe	241	626	385	160
Montgomery	23,574	25,899	2,325	10
Morgan	436	733	297	68
Morrow	496	1,021	525	106
Muskingum	2,184	3,283	1,099	50
Noble	177	355	178	101
Ottawa	582	664	82	14
Paulding	267	580	313	117
Perry	985	1,591	606	62
Pickaway	801	1,615	814	102
Pike	1,011	1,870	859	85
Portage	2,520	3,990	1,470	58
Preble	611	1,372	761	125
Putnam	324	565	241	74
Richland	3,300	4,269	969	29
Ross	2,097	2,634	537	26
Sandusky	950	1,567	617	65
Scioto	4,965	6,254	1,289	26
Seneca	800	1,846	1,046	131
Shelby	703	1,731	1,028	146
Stark	9,034	13,593	4,559	50
Summit	17,761	21,549	3,788	21
Trumbull	6,044	9,158	3,114	52
Tuscarawas	1,694	2,586	892	53
Union	510	714	204	40
Van Wert	300	525	225	75
Vinton	397	574	177	45
Warren	1,724	2,254	530	31
Washington	1,310	2,227	917	70
Wayne	1,092	1,786	694	64
Williams	328	718	390	119
Wood	1,042	1,747	705	68
Wyandot	335	294	−41	−12
Total	330,673	431,623	100,950	30

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Oklahoma:				
Adair	1,132	772	-360	-32
Alfalfa	58	24	-34	-59
Atoka	502	510	8	2
Beaver	9	40	31	344
Beckham	297	291	-6	-2
Blaine	240	231	-9	-4
Bryan	582	557	-25	-4
Caddo	1,127	816	-311	-28
Canadian	414	258	-156	-38
Carter	1,263	1,094	-169	-13
Cherokee	988	834	-154	-16
Choctaw	827	698	-129	-16
Cimarron	26	20	-6	-23
Cleveland	718	467	-251	-35
Coal	253	179	-74	-29
Comanche	2,231	2,517	286	13
Cotton	145	141	-4	-3
Craig	172	161	-11	-6
Creek	1,173	1,244	71	6
Custer	323	418	95	29
Delaware	769	630	-139	-18
Dewey	81	8	-73	-90
Ellis	28	29	1	4
Garfield	676	643	-33	-5
Garvin	392	527	135	34
Grady	547	526	-21	-4
Grant	26	22	-4	-15
Greer	203	140	-63	-31
Harmon	134	135	1	1
Harper	9	0	-9	-100
Haskell	381	271	-110	-29
Hughes	338	300	-38	-11
Jackson	982	751	-231	-24
Jefferson	90	19	-71	-79
Johnston	313	295	-18	-6
Kay	423	474	51	12
Kingfisher	82	60	-22	-27
Kiowa	321	360	39	12
Latimer	324	274	-50	-15
Le Flore	1,272	1,330	58	5
Lincoln	392	428	36	9
Logan	332	395	63	19
Love	126	39	-87	-69
Major	22	45	23	105
Marshall	250	133	-117	-47
Mayes	556	530	-26	-5
McClain	226	148	-78	-35
McCurtain	1,827	1,591	-236	-13
McIntosh	516	345	-171	-33

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Murray	202	266	64	32
Muskogee	2,256	2,147	−109	−5
Noble	161	196	35	22
Nowata	146	179	33	23
Okfuskee	431	296	−135	−31
Oklahoma	14,767	12,380	−2,387	−16
Okmulgee	1,480	1,332	−148	−10
Osage	577	628	51	9
Ottawa	660	608	−52	−8
Pawnee	211	276	65	31
Payne	354	348	−6	−2
Pittsburg	997	789	−208	−21
Pontotoc	496	403	−93	−19
Pottawatomie	1,104	1,207	103	9
Pushmataha	341	299	−42	−12
Roger Mills	60	90	30	50
Rogers	395	473	78	20
Seminole	1,036	971	−65	−6
Sequoyah	981	952	−29	−3
Stephens	361	528	167	46
Texas	93	141	48	52
Tillman	495	347	−148	−30
Tulsa	9,360	9,601	241	3
Wagoner	844	813	−31	−4
Washington	252	406	154	61
Washita	100	112	12	12
Woods	79	38	−41	−52
Woodward	66	91	25	38
Total	62,423	57,637	−4,786	−8
Oregon:				
Baker	423	215	−208	−49
Benton	1,087	568	−519	−48
Clackamas	4,173	1,678	−2,495	−60
Clatsop	755	405	−350	−46
Columbia	959	533	−426	−44
Coos	2,557	1,214	−1,343	−53
Crook	351	189	−162	−46
Curry	436	260	−176	−40
Deschutes	1,270	823	−447	−35
Douglas	3,108	1,804	−1,304	−42
Gilliam	97	66	−31	−32
Grant	217	115	−102	−47
Harney	170	115	−55	−32
Hood River	216	185	−31	−14
Jackson	4,593	2,272	−2,321	−51
Jefferson	279	235	−44	−16
Josephine	2,622	1,474	−1,148	−44
Klamath	1,669	858	−811	−49
Lake	175	104	−71	−41

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Lane	9,927	6,715	−3,212	−32
Lincoln	900	681	−219	−24
Linn	3,469	2,115	−1,354	−39
Malheur	1,033	415	−618	−60
Marion	5,961	4,110	−1,851	−31
Morrow	150	0	−150	−100
Multnomah	21,004	12,667	−8,337	−40
Polk	1,072	584	−488	−46
Sherman	0	0	0	.
Tillamook	562	311	−251	−45
Umatilla	1,351	1,139	−212	−16
Union	554	366	−188	−34
Wallowa	136	85	−51	−38
Wasco	448	370	−78	−17
Washington	3,747	2,296	−1,451	−39
Wheeler	0	0	0	.
Yamhill	1,472	971	−501	−34
Total	76,943	45,938	−31,005	−40
Pennsylvania:				
Adams	815	551	−264	−32
Allegheny	51,730	47,403	−4,327	−8
Armstrong	1,706	2,361	655	38
Beaver	4,095	6,943	2,848	70
Bedford	1,024	1,233	209	20
Berks	6,054	5,735	−319	−5
Blair	3,527	4,293	766	22
Bradford	2,482	2,097	−385	−16
Bucks	8,306	5,414	−2,892	−35
Butler	2,541	3,068	527	21
Cambria	3,068	5,337	2,269	74
Cameron	166	205	39	23
Carbon	693	819	126	18
Centre	1,398	1,270	−128	−9
Chester	6,430	4,829	−1,601	−25
Clarion	804	1,122	318	40
Clearfield	1,872	2,209	337	18
Clinton	1,107	1,463	356	32
Columbia	1,237	1,086	−151	−12
Crawford	2,275	3,115	840	37
Cumberland	1,041	962	−79	−8
Dauphin	8,193	6,958	−1,235	−15
Delaware	15,415	11,703	−3,712	−24
Elk	597	721	124	21
Erie	9,443	10,688	1,245	13
Fayette	8,385	9,457	1,072	13
Forest	104	142	38	37
Franklin	1,298	1,623	325	25
Fulton	324	264	−60	−19
Greene	1,477	1,959	482	33

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Huntingdon	1,240	976	−264	−21
Indiana	1,603	2,019	416	26
Jefferson	659	624	−35	−5
Juniata	323	282	−41	−13
Lackawanna	5,688	5,757	69	1
Lancaster	5,761	5,984	223	4
Lawrence	3,118	3,913	795	25
Lebanon	1,365	1,260	−105	−8
Lehigh	4,633	4,582	−51	−1
Luzerne	8,566	8,391	−175	−2
Lycoming	3,376	909	−2,467	−73
McKean	1,618	1,685	67	4
Mercer	2,815	4,196	1,381	49
Mifflin	1,364	1,224	−140	−10
Monroe	1,119	1,079	−40	−4
Montgomery	6,866	5,478	−1,388	−20
Montour	225	207	−18	−8
Northampton	4,467	3,959	−508	−11
Northumberland	1,872	1,945	73	4
Perry	615	694	79	13
Philadelphia	176,490	147,673	−28,817	−16
Pike	196	171	−25	−13
Potter	645	626	−19	−3
Schuylkill	2,670	2,482	−188	−7
Snyder	388	461	73	19
Somerset	1,813	2,295	482	27
Sullivan	59	78	19	32
Susquehanna	894	799	−95	−11
Tioga	1,104	976	−128	−12
Union	334	467	133	40
Venango	1,773	2,064	291	16
Warren	878	1,014	136	15
Washington	5,449	6,617	1,168	21
Wayne	698	629	−69	−10
Westmoreland	8,083	9,457	1,374	17
Wyoming	804	847	43	5
York	4,942	4,717	−225	−5
Total	412,120	381,567	−30,553	−7
Rhode Island:				
Bristol	775	496	−279	−36
Kent	3,899	2,949	−950	−24
Newport	2,308	1,530	−778	−34
Providence	25,418	22,745	−2,673	−11
Washington	2,047	1,777	−270	−13
Total	34,447	29,497	−4,950	−14
South Carolina:				
Abbeville	761	611	−150	−20
Aiken	2,956	2,145	−811	−27

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Allendale	1,181	1,100	−81	−7
Anderson	1,882	2,110	228	12
Bamberg	1,528	1,051	−477	−31
Barnwell	1,419	1,089	−330	−23
Beaufort	2,588	1,845	−743	−29
Berkeley	2,406	1,904	−502	−21
Calhoun	804	480	−324	−40
Charleston	11,222	8,704	−2,518	−22
Cherokee	983	1,124	141	14
Chester	885	1,030	145	16
Chesterfield	1,327	1,225	−102	−8
Clarendon	2,038	1,680	−358	−18
Colleton	1,888	1,722	−166	−9
Darlington	3,677	2,549	−1,128	−31
Dillon	2,029	1,716	−313	−15
Dorchester	1,566	1,540	−26	−2
Edgefield	731	636	−95	−13
Fairfield	1,054	960	−94	−9
Florence	5,081	4,338	−743	−15
Georgetown	2,337	1,556	−781	−33
Greenville	4,855	4,641	−214	−4
Greenwood	1,333	1,324	−9	−1
Hampton	1,547	1,067	−480	−31
Horry	3,732	2,743	−989	−27
Jasper	1,219	809	−410	−34
Kershaw	1,111	889	−222	−20
Lancaster	953	1,176	223	23
Laurens	1,168	1,259	91	8
Lee	1,501	1,195	−306	−20
Lexington	1,600	1,484	−116	−7
Marion	1,719	1,908	189	11
Marlboro	577	1,313	736	128
McCormick	2,125	329	−1,796	−85
Newberry	857	800	−57	−7
Oconee	370	359	−11	−3
Orangeburg	5,777	5,218	−559	−10
Pickens	684	694	10	1
Richland	7,977	7,288	−689	−9
Saluda	573	266	−307	−54
Spartanburg	3,344	3,874	530	16
Sumter	4,661	3,989	−672	−14
Union	537	900	363	68
Williamsburg	2,691	2,634	−57	−2
York	1,944	2,132	188	10
Total	103,198	89,406	−13,792	−13
South Dakota:				
Aurora	29	9	−20	−69
Beadle	287	173	−114	−40
Bennett	227	188	−39	−17

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Bon Homme	83	37	−46	−55
Brookings	151	160	9	6
Brown	523	372	−151	−29
Brule	82	58	−24	−29
Buffalo	172	183	11	6
Butte	188	123	−65	−35
Campbell	4	3	−1	−25
Charles Mix	365	256	−109	−30
Clark	24	14	−10	−42
Clay	151	156	5	3
Codington	267	195	−72	−27
Corson	340	325	−15	−4
Custer	71	66	−5	−7
Davison	329	259	−70	−21
Day	95	96	1	1
Deuel	25	17	−8	−32
Dewey	368	452	84	23
Douglas	30	23	−7	−23
Edmunds	41	12	−29	−71
Fall River	186	175	−11	−6
Faulk	16	5	−11	−69
Grant	69	49	−20	−29
Gregory	124	118	−6	−5
Haakon	24	13	−11	−46
Hamlin	31	21	−10	−32
Hand	19	3	−16	−84
Hanson	21	10	−11	−52
Harding	4	3	−1	−25
Hughes	310	205	−105	−34
Hutchinson	43	25	−18	−42
Hyde	33	7	−26	−79
Jackson	190	17	−173	−91
Jerauld	17	13	−4	−24
Jones	22	9	−13	−59
Kingsbury	52	24	−28	−54
Lake	109	109	0	0
Lawrence	298	283	−15	−5
Lincoln	121	99	−22	−18
Lyman	134	112	−22	−16
Marshall	70	37	−33	−47
McCook	78	43	−35	−45
McPherson	27	6	−21	−78
Meade	232	177	−55	−24
Mellette	206	159	−47	−23
Miner	25	11	−14	−56
Minnehaha	1,609	1,196	−413	−26
Moody	78	44	−34	−44
Pennington	2,027	1,838	−189	−9
Perkins	43	28	−15	−35
Potter	30	6	−24	−80

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Roberts	336	274	−62	−18
Sanborn	35	17	−18	−51
Shannon	1,981	1,284	−697	−35
Spink	91	66	−25	−27
Stanley	65	10	−55	−85
Sully	10	4	−6	−60
Todd	1,033	836	−197	−19
Tripp	212	209	−3	−1
Turner	71	31	−40	−56
Union	118	100	−18	−15
Walworth	151	144	−7	−5
Yankton	282	176	−106	−38
Ziebach	236	177	−59	−25
Total	14,721	11,350	−3,371	−23
Tennessee:				
Anderson	1,385	1,198	−187	−14
Bedford	379	413	34	9
Benton	209	203	−6	−3
Bledsoe	198	162	−36	−18
Blount	1,116	993	−123	−11
Bradley	709	539	−170	−24
Campbell	1,040	1,132	92	9
Cannon	75	115	40	53
Carroll	504	403	−101	−20
Carter	836	742	−94	−11
Cheatham	231	235	4	2
Chester	239	186	−53	−22
Claiborne	638	560	−78	−12
Clay	213	147	−66	−31
Cocke	864	1,032	168	19
Coffee	380	422	42	11
Crockett	448	343	−105	−23
Cumberland	500	457	−43	−9
Davidson	11,778	11,819	41	0
De Kalb	178	163	−15	−8
Decatur	109	91	−18	−17
Dickson	361	434	73	20
Dyer	796	794	−2	−0
Fayette	1,654	1,322	−332	−20
Fentress	260	352	92	35
Franklin	533	486	−47	−9
Gibson	1,231	925	−306	−25
Giles	382	415	33	9
Grainger	311	260	−51	−16
Greene	674	707	33	5
Grundy	312	462	150	48
Hamblen	788	867	79	10
Hamilton	7,218	6,786	−432	−6
Hancock	364	328	−36	−10

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Hardeman	1,428	1,156	−272	−19
Hardin	425	317	−108	−25
Hawkins	542	548	6	1
Haywood	1,202	1,022	−180	−15
Henderson	303	221	−82	−27
Henry	369	409	40	11
Hickman	244	210	−34	−14
Houston	164	153	−11	−7
Humphreys	242	250	8	3
Jackson	129	124	−5	−4
Jefferson	466	474	8	2
Johnson	339	377	38	11
Knox	6,915	5,998	−917	−13
Lake	458	296	−162	−35
Lauderdale	1,030	925	−105	−10
Lawrence	315	371	56	18
Lewis	119	135	16	13
Lincoln	369	292	−77	−21
Loudon	333	324	−9	−3
Macon	144	166	22	15
Madison	2,446	2,059	−387	−16
Marion	541	535	−6	−1
Marshall	268	239	−29	−11
Maury	873	1,012	139	16
McMinn	410	562	152	37
McNairy	361	385	24	7
Meigs	122	81	−41	−34
Monroe	542	471	−71	−13
Montgomery	1,150	901	−249	−22
Moore	18	36	18	100
Morgan	536	461	−75	−14
Obion	524	477	−47	−9
Overton	254	222	−32	−13
Perry	88	77	−11	−13
Pickett	93	50	−43	−46
Polk	206	144	−62	−30
Putnam	350	362	12	3
Rhea	552	576	24	4
Roane	884	765	−119	−13
Robertson	714	582	−132	−18
Rutherford	979	820	−159	−16
Scott	903	731	−172	−19
Sequatchie	234	202	−32	−14
Sevier	472	537	65	14
Shelby	39,932	35,451	−4,481	−11
Smith	134	150	16	12
Stewart	121	94	−27	−22
Sullivan	1,811	1,429	−382	−21
Sumner	943	853	−90	−10
Tipton	1,333	1,136	−197	−15

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Trousdale	76	70	−6	−8
Unicoi	254	239	−15	−6
Union	336	312	−24	−7
Van Buren	45	54	9	20
Warren	340	323	−17	−5
Washington	1,070	1,140	70	7
Wayne	165	105	−60	−36
Weakley	334	309	−25	−7
White	185	198	13	7
Williamson	918	650	−268	−29
Wilson	642	616	−26	−4
Total	114,608	104,677	−9,931	−9
Texas:				
Anderson	515	480	−35	−7
Andrews	38	36	−2	−5
Angelina	661	957	296	45
Aransas	141	215	74	52
Archer	12	15	3	25
Armstrong	0	1	1	.
Atascosa	693	578	−115	−17
Austin	203	264	61	30
Bailey	85	107	22	26
Bandera	32	25	−7	−22
Bastrop	358	454	96	27
Baylor	31	23	−8	−26
Bee	717	700	−17	−2
Bell	1,618	2,471	853	53
Bexar	27,535	25,577	−1,958	−7
Blanco	10	8	−2	−20
Borden	2	0	−2	−100
Bosque	72	66	−6	−8
Bowie	2,184	2,142	−42	−2
Brazoria	758	763	5	1
Brazos	821	774	−47	−6
Brewster	98	68	−30	−31
Briscoe	36	26	−10	−28
Brooks	338	351	13	4
Brown	181	420	239	132
Burleson	353	314	−39	−11
Burnet	169	167	−2	−1
Caldwell	492	481	−11	−2
Calhoun	388	312	−76	−20
Callahan	34	53	19	56
Cameron	7,571	8,450	879	12
Camp	171	220	49	29
Carson	5	21	16	320
Cass	593	720	127	21
Castro	102	209	107	105
Chambers	252	311	59	23

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Cherokee	486	586	100	21
Childress	52	86	34	65
Clay	33	38	5	15
Cochran	80	69	−11	−14
Coke	5	22	17	340
Coleman	167	147	−20	−12
Collin	656	828	172	26
Collingsworth	56	36	−20	−36
Colorado	360	325	−35	−10
Comal	196	316	120	61
Comanche	101	63	−38	−38
Concho	18	19	1	6
Cooke	143	164	21	15
Coryell	199	363	164	82
Cottle	51	45	−6	−12
Crane	18	12	−6	−33
Crockett	28	45	17	61
Crosby	78	147	69	88
Culberson	25	34	9	36
Dallam	38	20	−18	−47
Dallas	20,136	21,157	1,021	5
Dawson	355	313	−42	−12
De Witt	422	374	−48	−11
Deaf Smith	424	358	−66	−16
Delta	135	58	−77	−57
Denton	458	490	32	7
Dickens	55	75	20	36
Dimmit	588	491	−97	−16
Donley	28	53	25	89
Duval	480	491	11	2
Eastland	109	78	−31	−28
Ector	679	1,218	539	79
Edwards	50	50	0	0
El Paso	8,022	9,393	1,371	17
Ellis	894	698	−196	−22
Erath	46	84	38	83
Falls	417	430	13	3
Fannin	371	298	−73	−20
Fayette	156	160	4	3
Fisher	86	54	−32	−37
Floyd	161	198	37	23
Foard	41	25	−16	−39
Fort Bend	1,120	976	−144	−13
Franklin	8	23	15	188
Freestone	203	217	14	7
Frio	671	744	73	11
Gaines	126	102	−24	−19
Galveston	2,389	2,888	499	21
Garza	101	122	21	21
Gillespie	72	69	−3	−4

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Glasscock	11	14	3	27
Goliad	95	96	1	1
Gonzales	414	455	41	10
Gray	111	123	12	11
Grayson	615	787	172	28
Gregg	1,507	1,672	165	11
Grimes	411	451	40	10
Guadalupe	475	547	72	15
Hale	533	663	130	24
Hall	99	98	−1	−1
Hamilton	33	31	−2	−6
Hansford	20	7	−13	−65
Hardeman	100	74	−26	−26
Hardin	586	711	125	21
Harris	29,577	46,189	16,612	56
Harrison	1,784	1,555	−229	−13
Hartley	5	2	−3	−60
Haskell	138	83	−55	−40
Hays	438	607	169	39
Hemphill	6	7	1	17
Henderson	485	569	84	17
Hidalgo	11,330	12,779	1,449	13
Hill	360	422	62	17
Hockley	279	280	1	0
Hood	49	79	30	61
Hopkins	257	160	−97	−38
Houston	610	637	27	4
Howard	489	587	98	20
Hudspeth	18	73	55	306
Hunt	718	845	127	18
Hutchinson	74	55	−19	−26
Irion	10	2	−8	−80
Jack	11	24	13	118
Jackson	371	315	−56	−15
Jasper	681	765	84	12
Jeff Davis	31	6	−25	−81
Jefferson	3,840	5,130	1,290	34
Jim Hogg	118	105	−13	−11
Jim Wells	1,171	1,106	−65	−6
Johnson	478	524	46	10
Jones	277	240	−37	−13
Karnes	400	389	−11	−3
Kaufman	621	594	−27	−4
Kendall	66	27	−39	−59
Kenedy	4	3	−1	−25
Kent	1	8	7	700
Kerr	299	344	45	15
Kimble	46	26	−20	−43
King	0	3	3	.
Kinney	58	55	−3	−5

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Kleberg	993	1,042	49	5
Knox	133	102	-31	-23
La Salle	276	266	-10	-4
Lamar	1,163	940	-223	-19
Lamb	313	310	-3	-1
Lampasas	95	163	68	72
Lavaca	171	206	35	20
Lee	123	82	-41	-33
Leon	194	131	-63	-32
Liberty	683	906	223	33
Limestone	454	307	-147	-32
Lipscomb	5	5	0	0
Live Oak	90	107	17	19
Llano	27	20	-7	-26
Lubbock	1,715	2,394	679	40
Lynn	132	167	35	27
Madison	192	192	0	0
Marion	331	365	34	10
Martin	63	101	38	60
Mason	9	7	-2	-22
Matagorda	494	559	65	13
Maverick	945	1,306	361	38
McCulloch	132	97	-35	-27
McLennan	2,993	3,108	115	4
McMullen	9	1	-8	-89
Medina	414	431	17	4
Menard	16	31	15	94
Midland	879	768	-111	-13
Milam	481	465	-16	-3
Mills	15	5	-10	-67
Mitchell	107	97	-10	-9
Montague	78	64	-14	-18
Montgomery	808	807	-1	-0
Moore	82	85	3	4
Morris	402	350	-52	-13
Motley	15	14	-1	-7
Nacogdoches	514	710	196	38
Navarro	589	581	-8	-1
Newton	311	408	97	31
Nolan	179	208	29	16
Nueces	6,815	6,132	-683	-10
Ochiltree	22	32	10	45
Oldham	5	2	-3	-60
Orange	867	1,113	246	28
Palo Pinto	166	282	116	70
Panola	306	348	42	14
Parker	165	234	69	42
Parmer	54	107	53	98
Pecos	129	147	18	14
Polk	486	508	22	5

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Potter	766	1,001	235	31
Presidio	54	82	28	52
Rains	35	23	−12	−34
Randall	39	64	25	64
Reagan	16	28	12	75
Real	55	38	−17	−31
Red River	433	358	−75	−17
Reeves	242	266	24	10
Refugio	231	220	−11	−5
Roberts	3	0	−3	−100
Robertson	731	718	−13	−2
Rockwall	88	19	−69	−78
Runnels	103	114	11	11
Rusk	709	748	39	6
Sabine	167	166	−1	−1
San Augustine	263	292	29	11
San Jacinto	350	356	6	2
San Patricio	1,411	1,610	199	14
San Saba	59	54	−5	−8
Schleicher	13	18	5	38
Scurry	185	119	−66	−36
Shackelford	31	16	−15	−48
Shelby	582	605	23	4
Sherman	8	0	−8	−100
Smith	1,819	2,061	242	13
Somervell	20	20	0	0
Starr	917	1,145	228	25
Stephens	71	68	−3	−4
Sterling	0	6	6	.
Stonewall	13	2	−11	−85
Sutton	14	12	−2	−14
Swisher	106	167	61	58
Tarrant	7,875	7,696	−179	−2
Taylor	767	572	−195	−25
Terrell	8	4	−4	−50
Terry	384	362	−22	−6
Throckmorton	22	13	−9	−41
Titus	155	359	204	132
Tom Green	890	745	−145	−16
Travis	4,290	5,347	1,057	25
Trinity	284	269	−15	−5
Tyler	218	241	23	11
Upshur	525	449	−76	−14
Upton	29	28	−1	−3
Uvalde	682	539	−143	−21
Val Verde	791	990	199	25
Van Zandt	267	229	−38	−14
Victoria	1,152	1,071	−81	−7
Walker	649	712	63	10
Waller	425	473	48	11

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Ward	96	73	−23	−24
Washington	489	391	−98	−20
Webb	2,935	3,421	486	17
Wharton	657	644	−13	−2
Wheeler	54	51	−3	−6
Wichita	1,068	1,099	31	3
Wilbarger	178	85	−93	−52
Willacy	676	701	25	4
Williamson	705	635	−70	−10
Wilson	341	186	−155	−45
Winkler	51	50	−1	−2
Wise	121	142	21	17
Wood	198	211	13	7
Yoakum	63	62	−1	−2
Young	72	90	18	25
Zapata	198	226	28	14
Zavala	744	613	−131	−18
Total	212,205	239,143	26,938	13
Utah:				
Beaver	70	45	−25	−36
Box Elder	429	364	−65	−15
Cache	388	418	30	8
Carbon	472	442	−30	−6
Daggett	10	1	−9	−90
Davis	1,397	1,541	144	10
Duchesne	181	182	1	1
Emery	124	132	8	6
Garfield	28	18	−10	−36
Grand	150	218	68	45
Iron	165	264	99	60
Juab	90	67	−23	−26
Kane	21	31	10	48
Millard	123	96	−27	−22
Morgan	21	19	−2	−10
Piute	23	14	−9	−39
Rich	6	13	7	117
Salt Lake	13,113	11,534	−1,579	−12
San Juan	1,351	584	−767	−57
Sanpete	232	146	−86	−37
Sevier	307	249	−58	−19
Summit	74	52	−22	−30
Tooele	408	490	82	20
Uintah	178	284	106	60
Utah	3,293	3,124	−169	−5
Wasatch	125	78	−47	−38
Washington	305	319	14	5
Wayne	23	3	−20	−87
Weber	3,445	3,772	327	9
Total	26,552	24,500	−2,052	−8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Vermont:				
Addison	623	813	190	30
Bennington	868	1,035	167	19
Caledonia	816	902	86	11
Chittenden	2,907	2,474	-433	-15
Essex	159	249	90	57
Franklin	1,473	1,396	-77	-5
Grand Isle	91	110	19	21
Lamoille	562	385	-177	-31
Orange	508	646	138	27
Orleans	546	806	260	48
Rutland	1,328	1,685	357	27
Washington	1,212	1,368	156	13
Windham	900	941	41	5
Windsor	1,237	1,330	93	8
Total	13,230	14,140	910	7
Virginia:				
Accomack	1,195	890	-305	-26
Albemarle	672	473	-199	-30
Alexandria	2,851	1,962	-889	-31
Alleghany	111	161	50	45
Amelia	148	123	-25	-17
Amherst	273	285	12	4
Appomattox	220	224	4	2
Arlington	1,373	1,311	-62	-5
Augusta	437	517	80	18
Bath	18	63	45	250
Bedford	392	426	34	9
Bland	40	37	-3	-8
Botetourt	290	140	-150	-52
Bristol	300	329	29	10
Brunswick	442	402	-40	-9
Buchanan	778	695	-83	-11
Buckingham	354	367	13	4
Buena Vista	114	146	32	28
Campbell	645	701	56	9
Caroline	478	457	-21	-4
Carroll	248	251	3	1
Charles City	352	226	-126	-36
Charlotte	386	399	13	3
Charlottesville	1,107	1,058	-49	-4
Chesapeake	3,076	3,089	13	0
Chesterfield	897	1,052	155	17
Clarke	101	94	-7	-7
Clifton Forge	45	113	68	151
Colonial Heights	125	102	-23	-18
Covington	164	194	30	18
Craig	16	20	4	25
Culpeper	396	424	28	7

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Cumberland	285	292	7	2
Danville	1,172	1,337	165	14
Dickenson	381	402	21	6
Dinwiddie	549	485	−64	−12
Emporia	208	179	−29	−14
Essex	137	107	−30	−22
Fairfax	4,316	4,048	−268	−6
Falls Church	20	4	−16	−80
Fauquier	341	364	23	7
Floyd	91	78	−13	−14
Fluvanna	246	253	7	3
Franklin	457	360	−97	−21
Franklin	482	379	−103	−21
Frederick	217	232	15	7
Fredericksburg	394	398	4	1
Galax	114	144	30	26
Giles	206	163	−43	−21
Gloucester	264	255	−9	−3
Goochland	233	172	−61	−26
Grayson	161	152	−9	−6
Greene	126	102	−24	−19
Greensville	530	435	−95	−18
Halifax	977	919	−58	−6
Hampton	4,123	2,845	−1,278	−31
Hanover	453	336	−117	−26
Harrisonburg	179	312	133	74
Henrico	1,067	1,379	312	29
Henry	478	569	91	19
Highland	15	26	11	73
Hopewell	580	815	235	41
Isle Of Wight	631	547	−84	−13
James City	429	379	−50	−12
King And Queen	173	169	−4	−2
King George	208	206	−2	−1
King William	212	180	−32	−15
Lancaster	320	297	−23	−7
Lee	636	650	14	2
Lexington	85	54	−31	−36
Loudoun	471	380	−91	−19
Louisa	412	444	32	8
Lunenburg	165	214	49	30
Lynchburg	1,426	1,528	102	7
Madison	172	115	−57	−33
Manassas	205	215	10	5
Manassas Park	195	140	−55	−28
Martinsville	467	393	−74	−16
Mathews	119	114	−5	−4
Mecklenburg	241	370	129	54
Middlesex	74	92	18	24
Montgomery	700	745	45	6

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Nelson	294	228	−66	−22
New Kent	103	93	−10	−10
Newport News	5,728	5,411	−317	−6
Norfolk	14,998	12,573	−2,425	−16
Northampton	835	676	−159	−19
Northumberland	196	223	27	14
Norton	102	163	61	60
Nottoway	398	343	−55	−14
Orange	328	258	−70	−21
Page	258	216	−42	−16
Patrick	126	186	60	48
Petersburg	2,914	2,604	−310	−11
Pittsylvania	1,086	1,126	40	4
Portsmouth	6,180	5,666	−514	−8
Powhatan	161	64	−97	−60
Prince Edward	492	534	42	9
Prince George	224	263	39	17
Prince William	1,618	1,581	−37	−2
Pulaski	416	632	216	52
Radford	86	82	−4	−5
Rappahannock	80	57	−23	−29
Richmond County	145	140	−5	−3
Richmond	14,428	12,835	−1,593	−11
Roanoke County	606	495	−111	−18
Roanoke	4,637	3,848	−789	−17
Rockbridge	195	229	34	17
Rockingham	403	333	−70	−17
Russell	508	521	13	3
Scott	316	384	68	22
Shenandoah	226	241	15	7
Smyth	424	518	94	22
Southampton	699	610	−89	−13
Spotsylvania	510	306	−204	−40
Stafford	312	266	−46	−15
Staunton	236	487	251	106
Suffolk	2,087	2,050	−37	−2
Surry	256	198	−58	−23
Sussex	517	500	−17	−3
Tazewell	801	1,074	273	34
Virginia Beach	3,037	2,402	−635	−21
Warren	218	301	83	38
Washington	472	416	−56	−12
Waynesboro	264	227	−37	−14
Westmoreland	490	449	−41	−8
Williamsburg	70	51	−19	−27
Winchester	391	314	−77	−20
Wise	650	1,093	443	68
Wythe	340	448	108	32
York	381	293	−88	−23
Total	114,429	105,513	−8,916	−8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Washington:				
Adams	387	443	56	14
Asotin	634	705	71	11
Benton	876	1,639	763	87
Chelan	1,102	1,165	63	6
Clallam	1,342	1,696	354	26
Clark	4,047	6,553	2,506	62
Columbia	101	121	20	20
Cowlitz	2,289	3,055	766	33
Douglas	339	388	49	14
Ferry	109	189	80	73
Franklin	894	1,220	326	36
Garfield	16	31	15	94
Grant	1,224	1,385	161	13
Grays Harbor	1,905	2,334	429	23
Island	450	434	−16	−4
Jefferson	433	364	−69	−16
King	23,061	24,091	1,030	4
Kitsap	2,442	2,540	98	4
Kittitas	488	454	−34	−7
Klickitat	343	593	250	73
Lewis	1,331	1,869	538	40
Lincoln	113	139	26	23
Mason	767	871	104	14
Okanogan	902	1,183	281	31
Pacific	351	530	179	51
Pend Oreille	425	444	19	4
Pierce	14,849	15,776	927	6
San Juan	46	50	4	9
Skagit	1,666	1,944	278	17
Skamania	136	216	80	59
Snohomish	6,707	7,584	877	13
Spokane	8,166	9,290	1,124	14
Stevens	584	944	360	62
Thurston	2,602	3,137	535	21
Wahkiakum	84	70	−14	−17
Walla Walla	1,128	1,136	8	1
Whatcom	2,119	2,855	736	35
Whitman	198	191	−7	−4
Yakima	6,600	7,826	1,226	19
Total	91,256	105,455	14,199	16
West Virginia:				
Barbour	562	760	198	35
Berkeley	1,073	996	−77	−7
Boone	1,121	1,263	142	13
Braxton	505	476	−29	−6
Brooke	745	698	−47	−6
Cabell	2,936	2,794	−142	−5
Calhoun	305	281	−24	−8

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Clay	495	886	391	79
Doddridge	204	235	31	15
Fayette	2,966	2,769	−197	−7
Gilmer	195	222	27	14
Grant	340	215	−125	−37
Greenbrier	526	878	352	67
Hampshire	570	419	−151	−26
Hancock	946	1,170	224	24
Hardy	263	200	−63	−24
Harrison	2,084	2,316	232	11
Jackson	341	682	341	100
Jefferson	885	662	−223	−25
Kanawha	4,223	5,730	1,507	36
Lewis	650	544	−106	−16
Lincoln	1,076	1,658	582	54
Logan	1,679	2,243	564	34
Marion	1,767	1,819	52	3
Marshall	1,010	1,161	151	15
Mason	420	1,030	610	145
McDowell	4,142	4,444	302	7
Mercer	2,486	2,871	385	15
Mineral	897	689	−208	−23
Mingo	2,730	3,028	298	11
Monongalia	721	1,008	287	40
Monroe	140	272	132	94
Morgan	156	171	15	10
Nicholas	882	1,013	131	15
Ohio	1,709	1,375	−334	−20
Pendleton	221	131	−90	−41
Pleasants	143	191	48	34
Pocahontas	200	149	−51	−26
Preston	911	974	63	7
Putnam	519	702	183	35
Raleigh	2,691	2,674	−17	−1
Randolph	742	709	−33	−4
Ritchie	213	254	41	19
Roane	409	520	111	27
Summers	732	687	−45	−6
Taylor	546	662	116	21
Tucker	161	108	−53	−33
Tyler	209	323	114	55
Upshur	594	647	53	9
Wayne	1,150	1,629	479	42
Webster	736	771	35	5
Wetzel	489	857	368	75
Wirt	74	206	132	178
Wood	1,863	2,155	292	16
Wyoming	1,772	1,851	79	4
Total	56,125	63,178	7,053	13

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Wisconsin:				
Adams	352	619	267	76
Ashland	518	749	231	45
Barron	1,131	1,458	327	29
Bayfield	436	764	328	75
Brown	4,393	4,939	546	12
Buffalo	318	424	106	33
Burnett	610	684	74	12
Calumet	407	444	37	9
Chippewa	1,701	2,112	411	24
Clark	682	1,020	338	50
Columbia	1,069	1,138	69	6
Crawford	431	578	147	34
Dane	5,778	5,901	123	2
Dodge	1,160	1,391	231	20
Door	263	484	221	84
Douglas	2,153	2,744	591	27
Dunn	851	1,068	217	25
Eau Claire	2,405	3,123	718	30
Florence	141	168	27	19
Fond du Lac	1,749	2,221	472	27
Forest	440	593	153	35
Grant	727	1,253	526	72
Green	634	764	130	21
Green Lake	336	479	143	43
Iowa	304	495	191	63
Iron	183	227	44	24
Jackson	579	1,009	430	74
Jefferson	918	1,604	686	75
Juneau	575	949	374	65
Kenosha	4,037	5,607	1,570	39
Kewaunee	207	376	169	82
La Crosse	1,966	3,045	1,079	55
Lafayette	257	403	146	57
Langlade	799	1,084	285	36
Lincoln	500	977	477	95
Manitowoc	1,397	2,113	716	51
Marathon	2,147	3,008	861	40
Marinette	1,246	1,511	265	21
Marquette	291	425	134	46
Menominee	610	881	271	44
Milwaukee	53,794	68,863	15,069	28
Monroe	827	1,312	485	59
Oconto	655	1,027	372	57
Oneida	849	986	137	16
Outagamie	2,363	3,407	1,044	44
Ozaukee	608	598	−10	−2
Pepin	179	219	40	22
Pierce	489	661	172	35
Polk	983	1,308	325	33

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

State and County	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979	Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Portage	1,142	1,371	229	20
Price	334	463	129	39
Racine	7,054	8,410	1,356	19
Richland	527	748	221	42
Rock	4,581	6,263	1,682	37
Rusk	419	842	423	101
Sauk	1,286	1,392	106	8
Sawyer	612	992	380	62
Shawano	760	1,228	468	62
Sheboygan	1,592	2,397	805	51
St. Croix	702	850	148	21
Taylor	323	454	131	41
Trempealeau	684	842	158	23
Vernon	429	796	367	86
Vilas	413	665	252	61
Walworth	1,088	1,568	480	44
Washburn	441	611	170	39
Washington	1,290	1,664	374	29
Waukesha	2,582	3,188	606	23
Waupaca	879	1,186	307	35
Waushara	443	679	236	53
Winnebago	3,159	3,395	236	7
Wood	1,603	2,013	410	26
Total	137,791	179,230	41,439	30
Wyoming:				
Albany	236	249	13	6
Big Horn	120	144	24	20
Campbell	86	197	111	129
Carbon	192	385	193	101
Converse	112	154	42	38
Crook	51	23	−28	−55
Fremont	361	496	135	37
Goshen	193	274	81	42
Hot Springs	38	43	5	13
Johnson	20	44	24	120
Laramie	1,174	1,305	131	11
Lincoln	76	81	5	7
Natrona	733	1,170	437	60
Niobrara	38	36	−2	−5
Park	197	181	−16	−8
Platte	79	75	−4	−5
Sheridan	168	252	84	50
Sublette	5	18	13	260
Sweetwater	250	508	258	103
Teton	23	29	6	26
Uinta	83	146	63	76
Washakie	87	95	8	9
Weston	53	81	28	53
Total	4,375	5,986	1,611	1,086

TABLE F-2

1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

CALIFORNIA:
- Alameda
- Alpine
- Amador
- Butte
- Calaveras
- Colusa
- Contra Costa
- Del Norte
- El Dorado
- Fresno
- Glenn
- Humboldt
- Imperial
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kings
- Lake
- Lassen
- Los Angeles
- Madera
- Mariposa
- Mendocino
- Merced
- Modoc
- Monterey
- Napa
- Nevada
- Orange
- Placer
- Plumas
- Riverside
- Sacramento
- San Benito
- San Bernardino
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- San Joaquin
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Shasta
- Siskiyou
- Solano
- Sonoma
- Stanislaus
- Sutter
- Tehama
- Trinity
- Tulare
- Tuolumne
- Ventura
- Yolo
- Yuba

COLORADO:
- Adams
- Alamosa
- Bent
- Chaffee
- Crowley
- Delta
- Denver
- Fremont
- Mesa
- Pueblo
- Rio Blanco

CONNECTICUT:
- Fairfield
- Hartford
- New Haven
- Tolland
- Windham

DELAWARE:
- New Castle

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
- Washington

GEORGIA:
- Fulton
- Twiggs
- Upson

HAWAII:
- Hawaii
- Honolulu
- Kauai
- Maui

IDAHO:
- Benewah
- Shoshone

ILLINOIS:
- Adams
- Alexander
- Bond
- Cass
- Champaign
- Christian
- Coles
- Cook
- De Kalb
- Effingham
- Franklin
- Fulton
- Grundy
- Hardin

ILLINOIS—Cont.
- Henderson
- Henry
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Kane
- Kankakee
- Knox
- La Salle
- Lake
- Lee
- Logan
- Macon
- Macoupin
- Madison
- Marion
- Marshall
- Mason
- Massac
- McLean
- Menard
- Montgomery
- Morgan
- Peoria
- Perry
- Pope
- Pulaski
- Randolph
- Rock Island
- Sangamon
- St. Clair
- Stephenson
- Tazewell
- Union
- Vermilion
- White
- Whiteside
- Will
- Williamson
- Winnebago
- Woodford

INDIANA:
- Floyd
- Howard
- Lake
- Marion
- St. Joseph

IOWA:
- Appanoose
- Black Hawk
- Boone
- Bremer
- Cerro Gordo
- Clay

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

IOWA—Cont.
- Clinton
- Dallas
- Des Moines
- Dubuque
- Floyd
- Henry
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Lee
- Linn
- Louisa
- Marshall
- Mills
- Muscatine
- Page
- Polk
- Pottawattamie
- Scott
- Union
- Wapello
- Warren
- Webster
- Woodbury

KANSAS:
- Atchison
- Butler
- Cherokee
- Cowley
- Crawford
- Ford
- Franklin
- Harvey
- Labette
- Miami
- Montgomery
- Reno
- Saline
- Sedgwick
- Shawnee
- Wyandotte

KENTUCKY:
- Campbell
- Jefferson
- Kenton
- McCracken

LOUISIANA:
- St. John The Baptist

MAINE:
- Androscoggin
- Cumberland
- Franklin

MAINE—Cont.
- Kennebec
- Penobscot
- York

MARYLAND:
- Allegany
- Baltimore City
- Cecil
- Charles
- Dorchester
- Prince George's
- Queen Anne's
- Somerset

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Berkshire
- Bristol
- Essex
- Franklin
- Hampden
- Plymouth
- Suffolk
- Worcester

MICHIGAN:
- Alcona
- Alger
- Allegan
- Alpena
- Antrim
- Arenac
- Baraga
- Barry
- Bay
- Benzie
- Berrien
- Branch
- Calhoun
- Cass
- Charlevoix
- Cheboygan
- Chippewa
- Clare
- Clinton
- Crawford
- Delta
- Dickinson
- Eaton
- Emmet
- Genesee
- Gladwin
- Gogebic
- Grand Traverse
- Gratiot
- Hillsdale

MICHIGAN—Cont.
- Houghton
- Huron
- Ingham
- Ionia
- Iosco
- Iron
- Isabella
- Jackson
- Kalamazoo
- Kalkaska
- Kent
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Lapeer
- Lenawee
- Livingston
- Luce
- Mackinac
- Macomb
- Manistee
- Marquette
- Mason
- Mecosta
- Menominee
- Midland
- Missaukee
- Monroe
- Montcalm
- Montmorency
- Muskegon
- Newaygo
- Oakland
- Oceana
- Ogemaw
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Otsego
- Ottawa
- Roscommon
- Saginaw
- Sanilac
- Schoolcraft
- Shiawassee
- St. Clair
- St. Joseph
- Tuscola
- Van Buren
- Washtenaw
- Wayne
- Wexford

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

MINNESOTA:
- Anoka
- Beltrami
- Blue Earth
- Carlton
- Cass
- Chisago
- Clay
- Clearwater
- Dakota
- Hennepin
- Isanti
- Itasca
- Kandiyohi
- Koochiching
- Lake
- Mille Lacs
- Olmsted
- Pine
- Polk
- Ramsey
- Sherburne
- St. Louis
- Washington
- Wright

MISSISSIPPI:
- Claiborne

MISSOURI:
- Boone
- Buchanan
- Cole
- Dunklin
- Jackson
- Marion
- Mississippi
- Pemiscot
- Ralls
- Scott
- St. Francois
- St. Louis
- St. Louis City
- Stoddard
- Washington

MONTANA:
- Park
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Douglas
- Hall
- Lancaster
- Lincoln

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Scotts Bluff
- Thurston

NEVADA:
- Esmeralda

NEW HAMPSHIRE:
- Strafford

NEW JERSEY:
- Atlantic
- Burlington
- Camden
- Cape May
- Cumberland
- Essex
- Gloucester
- Hudson
- Mercer
- Middlesex
- Monmouth
- Ocean
- Passaic
- Salem
- Somerset
- Union
- Warren

NEW YORK:
- Allegany
- Chautauqua
- Chemung
- Cortland
- Erie
- Monroe
- New York
- Niagara
- Oneida
- Onondaga
- Orange
- Orleans
- Oswego
- Schenectady
- Suffolk
- Westchester

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Scotland

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Adams
- Allen
- Ashland

OHIO—Cont.
- Ashtabula
- Athens
- Auglaize
- Belmont
- Brown
- Butler
- Carroll
- Champaign
- Clark
- Clermont
- Clinton
- Columbiana
- Crawford
- Cuyahoga
- Darke
- Defiance
- Delaware
- Erie
- Fairfield
- Fayette
- Franklin
- Gallia
- Greene
- Guernsey
- Hamilton
- Hancock
- Hardin
- Harrison
- Henry
- Highland
- Hocking
- Huron
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Lake
- Lawrence
- Licking
- Logan
- Lorain
- Lucas
- Madison
- Mahoning
- Marion
- Medina
- Meigs
- Mercer
- Miami
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Morgan
- Morrow
- Muskingum
- Noble
- Ottawa

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

OHIO—Cont.
- Paulding
- Perry
- Pickaway
- Pike
- Portage
- Preble
- Richland
- Ross
- Sandusky
- Scioto
- Seneca
- Shelby
- Stark
- Summit
- Trumbull
- Tuscarawas
- Union
- Van Wert
- Vinton
- Warren
- Washington
- Williams
- Wood

OREGON:
- Gilliam
- Lane
- Multnomah

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Allegheny
- Armstrong
- Beaver
- Blair
- Butler
- Cambria
- Cameron
- Chester
- Clarion
- Clearfield
- Clinton
- Crawford
- Dauphin
- Delaware
- Elk
- Erie
- Fayette
- Greene
- Lackawanna
- Lawrence
- Lehigh
- Luzerne
- McKean
- Mercer
- Northampton

PENNSYLVANIA—Cont.
- Philadelphia
- Venango
- Washington
- Westmoreland
- Wyoming
- York

RHODE ISLAND:
- Kent
- Providence
- Washington

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale
- Newberry
- Union

UTAH:
- Carbon
- Weber

VERMONT:
- Bennington
- Chittenden
- Franklin
- Rutland
- Windsor

VIRGINIA:
- Buena Vista
- Charlottesville
- Fredericksburg
- Harrisonburg
- Hopewell
- Newport News
- Northumberland
- Petersburg
- Richmond City
- Staunton
- Williamsburg

WASHINGTON:
- Asotin
- Chelan
- Clallam
- Clark
- Columbia
- Cowlitz
- Grays Harbor
- King
- Klickitat
- Lewis
- Mason
- Pacific
- Pend Oreille

WASHINGTON—Cont.
- Pierce
- Skagit
- Skamania
- Snohomish
- Spokane
- Thurston
- Whatcom
- Yakima

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Boone
- Fayette
- Hancock
- Kanawha
- Lincoln
- Marshall
- Mason
- McDowell
- Mercer
- Mingo
- Taylor
- Wetzel
- Wirt

WISCONSIN:
- Adams
- Ashland
- Barron
- Bayfield
- Brown
- Burnett
- Calumet
- Chippewa
- Columbia
- Dane
- Dodge
- Door
- Douglas
- Dunn
- Eau Claire
- Florence
- Fond du Lac
- Forest
- Green
- Green Lake
- Iron
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Juneau
- Kenosha
- Kewaunee
- La Crosse
- Langlade
- Lincoln
- Manitowoc

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Marathon
- Marinette
- Marquette
- Menominee
- Milwaukee
- Monroe
- Oconto
- Oneida
- Outagamie
- Ozaukee
- Pepin
- Pierce
- Polk
- Portage

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Racine
- Richland
- Rock
- Rusk
- Sauk
- Sawyer
- Shawano
- Sheboygan
- St. Croix
- Trempealeau
- Vernon
- Vilas
- Walworth
- Washburn

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Washington
- Waukesha
- Waupaca
- Waushara
- Winnebago
- Wood

WYOMING:
- Carbon
- Laramie
- Natrona
- Sheridan
- Uinta

TABLE F-3

1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

- ALABAMA:
  - Bibb
  - Blount
  - Cherokee
  - Chilton
  - Clay
  - Cleburne
  - Covington
  - Cullman
  - Dale
  - De Kalb
  - Lamar
  - Lawrence
  - Marion
  - Marshall
  - Winston
- ARIZONA:
  - Yuma
- ARKANSAS:
  - Baxter
  - Benton
  - Boone
  - Carroll
  - Cleburne
  - Crawford
  - Faulkner
  - Franklin
  - Fulton
  - Garland
  - Grant
  - Greene
  - Hempstead
  - Howard
  - Izard
  - Johnson
  - Logan
  - Lonoke
  - Madison
  - Marion
  - Montgomery
  - Newton
  - Perry
  - Pike
  - Polk
  - Pope
  - Randolph
  - Saline
  - Scott
  - Searcy
  - Sebastian
  - Sevier
  - Sharp
  - Stone
  - Washington
- ARKANSAS—Cont.
  - White
  - Yell
- CALIFORNIA:
  - Sierra
- COLORADO:
  - Baca
  - Boulder
  - Cheyenne
  - Custer
  - Douglas
  - Eagle
  - Grand
  - Hinsdale
  - Kit Carson
  - Ouray
  - Park
  - Pitkin
  - Summit
  - Yuma
- FLORIDA:
  - Clay
  - Hillsborough
- GEORGIA:
  - Banks
  - Brantley
  - Chattahoochee
  - Cherokee
  - Dawson
  - Forsyth
  - Gwinnett
  - Habersham
  - Jeff Davis
  - Murray
  - Pickens
  - Towns
  - Union
  - White
  - Whitfield
- IDAHO:
  - Adams
  - Bear Lake
  - Bingham
  - Blaine
  - Bonneville
  - Butte
  - Caribou
  - Cassia
  - Clark
  - Custer
  - Elmore
- IDAHO—Cont.
  - Franklin
  - Fremont
  - Gooding
  - Jefferson
  - Jerome
  - Latah
  - Lemhi
  - Lincoln
  - Madison
  - Minidoka
  - Oneida
  - Owyhee
  - Teton
  - Twin Falls
  - Washington
- INDIANA:
  - Adams
  - Daviess
  - Dubois
  - Greene
  - Lagrange
  - Marshall
  - Owen
  - Pulaski
  - Putnam
  - Rush
  - Spencer
  - Steuben
- IOWA:
  - Audubon
  - Ida
  - Lyon
  - Mitchell
  - Plymouth
  - Shelby
  - Sioux
- KANSAS:
  - Barber
  - Cheyenne
  - Coffey
  - Comanche
  - Decatur
  - Dickinson
  - Edwards
  - Ellis
  - Ellsworth
  - Gove
  - Graham
  - Greeley
  - Harper
  - Haskell
  - Hodgeman

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

KANSAS—Cont.
Jewell
Kiowa
Lincoln
Marion
Marshall
Meade
Nemaha
Ness
Norton
Osborne
Pratt
Rawlins
Republic
Russell
Scott
Sheridan
Smith
Stanton
Trego
Washington

KENTUCKY:
Casey
Clinton

LOUISIANA:
Cameron
Vernon

MINNESOTA:
Chippewa
Lac qui Parle
Marshall
Norman
Pipestone
Red Lake
Renville
Rock
Stevens
Traverse
Yellow Medicine

MISSISSIPPI:
Attala
Rankin
Smith

MISSOURI:
Atchison
Gasconade
Knox
Macon
Mercer
Monroe
Nodaway

MISSOURI—Cont.
Osage
Putnam
Sullivan
Webster

MONTANA:
Broadwater
Carter
Chouteau
Daniels
Fallon
Fergus
Garfield
Golden Valley
Judith Basin
Liberty
Madison
McCone
Meagher
Musselshell
Petroleum
Phillips
Powder River
Prairie
Sheridan
Stillwater
Sweet Grass
Teton
Toole
Treasure
Wheatland
Wibaux
Yellowstone National Park

NEBRASKA:
Antelope
Arthur
Banner
Blaine
Boone
Boyd
Brown
Butler
Cedar
Chase
Cherry
Cheyenne
Cuming
Custer
Dixon
Franklin
Frontier
Furnas
Garfield

NEBRASKA—Cont.
Gosper
Greeley
Harlan
Hayes
Hitchcock
Holt
Hooker
Johnson
Kearney
Keya Paha
Knox
Logan
McPherson
Nance
Pawnee
Perkins
Pierce
Polk
Rock
Saline
Sherman
Sioux
Stanton
Thayer
Thomas
Valley
Wayne
Wheeler

NEVADA:
Churchill
Douglas
Elko
Eureka
Humboldt
Lander
Lincoln
Nye
Pershing
Storey

NEW MEXICO:
Catron
Harding
Lincoln
Los Alamos
Otero
Union
Valencia

NORTH CAROLINA:
Alexander
Alleghany
Ashe
Avery

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

NORTH CAROLINA—Cont.
- Carteret
- Cherokee
- Chowan
- Clay
- Currituck
- Davie
- Jackson
- Macon
- Madison
- Mitchell
- Moore
- Onslow
- Polk
- Randolph
- Stokes
- Surry
- Watauga
- Wilkes
- Yadkin
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Adams
- Barnes
- Billings
- Bowman
- Burke
- Cavalier
- Dickey
- Divide
- Dunn
- Emmons
- Golden Valley
- Grand Forks
- Grant
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- La Moure
- Logan
- McHenry
- McIntosh
- Mercer
- Nelson
- Oliver
- Pebina
- Pierce
- Ransom
- Renville
- Richland
- Sheridan
- Slope
- Stark
- Steele

NORTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Towner
- Walsh
- Wells

OHIO:
- Holmes

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Canadian
- Cimarron
- Cleveland
- Dewey
- Ellis
- Grant
- Harper
- Jefferson
- Kingfisher
- Love
- Major
- Marshall
- Payne
- Woods
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Malheur
- Morrow
- Sherman
- Wheeler

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Lycoming

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Oconee
- Saluda

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Aurora
- Beadle
- Bon Homme
- Brookings
- Brule
- Campbell
- Charles Mix
- Clark
- Custer
- Day
- Deuel
- Douglas
- Edmunds
- Faulk
- Grant

SOUTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Haakon
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Jerauld
- Jones
- Kingsbury
- Lincoln
- Lyman
- Marshall
- McCook
- McPherson
- Meade
- Miner
- Moody
- Perkins
- Potter
- Sanborn
- Spink
- Stanley
- Sully
- Turner
- Union

TENNESSEE:
- Bledsoe
- Bradley
- Cannon
- Carter
- Claiborne
- Coffee
- Cumberland
- De Kalb
- Decatur
- Fentress
- Grainger
- Greene
- Hawkins
- Henderson
- Jackson
- Lawrence
- Lewis
- Lincoln
- Monroe
- Moore
- Overton
- Pickett
- Polk
- Putnam

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

TENNESSEE—Cont.
- Stewart
- Sullivan
- Van Buren
- Warren
- Wayne
- White

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Andrews
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Atascosa
- Bailey
- Bandera
- Blanco
- Borden
- Bosque
- Brazoria
- Brewster
- Briscoe
- Burnet
- Callahan
- Carson
- Castro
- Clay
- Cochran
- Collingsworth
- Comanche
- Concho
- Cooke
- Coryell
- Cottle
- Crane
- Crosby
- Culberson
- Dallam
- Dawson
- Deaf Smith
- Delta
- Denton
- Dickens
- Donley
- Eastland
- Edwards
- El Paso
- Erath
- Fisher
- Floyd
- Foard
- Fort Bend
- Franklin
- Gaines
- Gillespie

TEXAS—Cont.
- Glasscock
- Gray
- Guadalupe
- Hale
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardeman
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hemphill
- Hockley
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Hudspeth
- Hutchinson
- Irion
- Jack
- Jeff Davis
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kimble
- King
- Kinney
- Knox
- Lamb
- Lampasas
- Lee
- Leon
- Linestone
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Llano
- Lubbock
- Lynn
- Mason
- Maverick
- McCulloch
- McMullen
- Medina
- Menard
- Mills
- Mitchell
- Montague
- Moore
- Motley
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parker
- Parmer
- Pecos
- Potter

TEXAS—Cont.
- Presidio
- Rains
- Randall
- Reagan
- Real
- Reeves
- Roberts
- Rockwall
- Runnels
- San Saba
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Starr
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Swisher
- Taylor
- Terrell
- Terry
- Throckmorton
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Van Zandt
- Ward
- Webb
- Wheeler
- Wichita
- Wilbarger
- Wilson
- Winkler
- Wise
- Wood
- Yoakum
- Young

UTAH:
- Beaver
- Cache
- Daggett
- Garfield
- Juab
- Kane
- Millard
- Morgan
- Rich
- Sanpete
- Summit
- Wasatch

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*

1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

UTAH—Cont.
- Washington
- Wayne

VIRGINIA:
- Bland
- Carroll
- Craig
- Essex
- Falls Church
- Floyd
- Frederick
- Giles

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Lexington
- Madison
- Mecklenburg
- Middlesex
- Page
- Powhatan
- Rockingham
- Scott
- Spotsylvania
- Virginia Beach
- Washington

WASHINGTON:
- San Juan

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Pendleton
- Tucker

WYOMING:
- Crook
- Lincoln
- Platte
- Sublette

TABLE F-4

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Alabama:		
Autauga	20	54
Baldwin	20	27
Barbour	36	47
Bibb	26	31
Blount	19	20
Bullock	46	47
Butler	36	44
Calhoun	20	45
Chambers	22	60
Cherokee	20	18
Chilton	22	27
Choctaw	34	59
Clarke	34	51
Clay	24	16
Cleburne	19	24
Coffee	17	38
Colbert	19	35
Conecuh	36	51
Coosa	31	39
Covington	23	37
Crenshaw	36	41
Cullman	18	15
Dale	20	20
Dallas	41	56
De Kalb	20	23
Elmore	24	39
Escambia	25	43
Etowah	20	35
Fayette	18	27
Franklin	19	35
Geneva	22	49
Greene	57	60
Hale	48	46
Henry	29	62
Houston	20	48
Jackson	16	28
Jefferson	20	62
Lamar	21	29
Lauderdale	17	32
Lawrence	27	40
Lee	21	41
Limestone	19	38
Lowndes	58	63
Macon	40	74
Madison	17	38
Marengo	42	56
Marion	15	31

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Marshall	17	32
Mobile	24	54
Monroe	34	38
Montgomery	27	44
Morgan	16	38
Perry	57	51
Pickens	33	72
Pike	34	49
Randolph	28	30
Russell	31	29
Shelby	14	36
St. Clair	19	35
Sumter	43	66
Talladega	25	60
Tallapoosa	21	54
Tuscaloosa	23	56
Walker	19	45
Washington	26	30
Wilcox	55	72
Winston	20	17
Alaska:		
Alaska	12	64
Arizona:		
Apache	43	33
Cochise	19	20
Coconino	22	30
Gila	19	29
Graham	20	28
Greenlee	10	35
Maricopa	13	28
Mohave	14	12
Navajo	33	20
Pima	15	30
Pinal	23	32
Santa Cruz	24	14
Yavapai	15	12
Yuma	21	12
Arkansas:		
Arkansas	26	40
Ashley	25	93
Baxter	16	18

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Benton	13	30
Boone	21	17
Bradley	30	38
Calhoun	30	42
Carroll	20	16
Chicot	48	62
Clark	19	37
Clay	25	32
Cleburne	23	16
Cleveland	17	45
Columbia	31	45
Conway	17	46
Craighead	17	33
Crawford	18	24
Crittenden	41	45
Cross	28	43
Dallas	19	75
Desha	32	59
Drew	17	49
Faulkner	12	19
Franklin	17	17
Fulton	25	19
Garland	18	38
Grant	16	20
Greene	20	25
Hempstead	25	33
Hot Spring	19	29
Howard	15	29
Independence	15	29
Izard	22	20
Jackson	26	45
Jefferson	28	44
Johnson	20	24
Lafayette	41	40
Lawrence	24	32
Lee	54	56
Lincoln	32	52
Little River	22	40
Logan	25	23
Lonoke	21	30
Madison	22	21
Marion	32	14
Miller	23	43
Mississippi	34	43

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Monroe	44	50
Montgomery	25	23
Nevada	27	52
Newton	32	21
Ouachita	27	58
Perry	15	38
Phillips	52	65
Pike	19	29
Poinsett	26	47
Polk	29	27
Pope	17	28
Prairie	26	36
Pulaski	17	61
Randolph	20	20
Saline	10	33
Scott	25	32
Searcy	31	20
Sebastian	16	26
Sevier	17	21
Sharp	32	26
St. Francis	42	46
Stone	36	26
Union	25	58
Van Buren	20	30
Washington	15	29
White	18	27
Woodruff	40	42
Yell	23	31
California:		
Alameda	14	130
Alpine	18	57
Amador	10	60
Butte	15	93
Calaveras	13	94
Colusa	12	56
Contra Costa	10	126
Del Norte	16	87
El Dorado	9	79
Fresno	20	87
Glenn	17	48
Humboldt	15	97
Imperial	20	64
Inyo	11	64
Kern	17	68

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Kings	19	84
Lake	18	105
Lassen	11	102
Los Angeles	18	98
Madera	21	74
Marin	8	63
Mariposa	15	60
Mendocino	14	116
Merced	20	86
Modoc	17	67
Mono	12	58
Monterey	15	80
Napa	9	92
Nevada	10	79
Orange	9	66
Placer	10	96
Plumas	12	74
Riverside	15	90
Sacramento	15	136
San Benito	16	56
San Bernardino	14	72
San Diego	14	85
San Francisco	19	128
San Joaquin	18	117
San Luis Obispo	13	67
San Mateo	7	106
Santa Barbara	11	89
Santa Clara	9	132
Santa Cruz	13	88
Shasta	13	114
Sierra	13	75
Siskiyou	15	71
Solano	12	96
Sonoma	11	117
Stanislaus	16	99
Sutter	14	84

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Tehama	16	75
Trinity	14	89
Tulare	23	87
Tuolumne	16	58
Ventura	10	89
Yolo	14	100
Yuba	20	92
Colorado:		
Adams	9	79
Alamosa	22	43
Arapahoe	5	32
Archuleta	21	29
Baca	25	23
Bent	13	86
Boulder	7	49
Chaffee	8	74
Cheyenne	24	6
Clear Creek	4	29
Conejos	36	39
Costilla	42	37
Crowley	21	81
Custer	21	27
Delta	15	60
Denver	20	90
Dolores	26	35
Douglas	4	12
Eagle	9	22
El Paso	13	38
Elbert	5	39
Fremont	12	72
Garfield	7	31
Gilpin	8	13
Grand	6	26
Gunnison	8	11
Hinsdale	14	20
Huerfano	30	50
Jackson	8	49
Jefferson	4	41
Kiowa	16	29
Kit Carson	24	11
La Plata	14	53
Lake	3	128
Larimer	9	50
Las Animas	27	66
Lincoln	12	34
Logan	11	35

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Mesa	9	49
Mineral	8	35
Moffat	6	34
Montezuma	17	24
Montrose	10	33
Morgan	15	52
Otero	28	70
Ouray	14	28
Park	12	9
Phillips	13	12
Pitkin	11	9
Prowers	23	62
Pueblo	17	90
Rio Blanco	5	25
Rio Grande	22	61
Routt	4	37
Saguache	35	37
San Juan	12	45
San Miguel	16	17
Sedgwick	10	41
Summit	5	2
Teller	14	21
Washington	17	19
Weld	15	57
Yuma	21	17
Connecticut:		
Fairfield	11	102
Hartford	12	115
Litchfield	6	70
Middlesex	8	76
New Haven	13	103
New London	11	79
Tolland	5	88
Windham	11	82
Delaware:		
Kent	17	299
New Castle	14	26
Sussex	18	62

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
District of Columbia:		
Washington	26	164
Florida:		
Alachua	21	44
Baker	22	29
Bay	21	28
Bradford	23	43
Brevard	13	46
Broward	13	30
Calhoun	29	31
Charlotte	12	31
Citrus	21	36
Clay	13	22
Collier	21	24
Columbia	22	37
Dade	19	37
De Soto	26	27
Dixie	30	28
Duval	22	52
Escambia	24	44
Flagler	27	50
Franklin	36	40
Gadsden	43	44
Gilchrist	20	19
Glades	24	31
Gulf	26	53
Hamilton	32	39
Hardee	35	23
Hendry	28	39
Hernando	20	37
Highlands	29	35
Hillsborough	17	48
Holmes	31	27
Indian River	16	43
Jackson	26	36
Jefferson	36	35
Lafayette	24	12
Lake	20	31
Lee	16	32
Leon	19	44
Levy	26	32
Liberty	26	40
Madison	37	47
Manatee	15	37
Marion	23	43

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Martin	16	28
Monroe	16	31
Nassau	13	52
Okaloosa	14	33
Okeechobee	17	39
Orange	18	44
Osceola	14	42
Palm Beach	14	39
Pasco	16	35
Pinellas	14	44
Polk	17	30
Putnam	29	45
Santa Rosa	20	25
Sarasota	13	25
Seminole	11	45
St. Johns	20	34
St. Lucie	26	53
Sumter	26	47
Suwannee	28	17
Taylor	29	33
Union	16	46
Volusia	19	40
Wakulla	20	39
Walton	29	33
Washington	29	34
Georgia:		
Appling	35	29
Atkinson	38	28
Bacon	25	45
Baker	30	45
Baldwin	19	50
Banks	12	19
Barrow	19	27
Bartow	14	36
Ben Hill	30	31
Berrien	22	35
Bibb	26	50
Bleckley	23	50
Brantley	22	24
Brooks	42	41
Bryan	23	41
Bulloch	25	38
Burke	35	54
Butts	21	52
Calhoun	34	41

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Camden	29	33
Candler	38	33
Carroll	18	37
Catoosa	13	31
Charlton	26	45
Chatham	25	55
Chattahoochee	12	21
Chattooga	22	32
Cherokee	12	21
Clarke	20	39
Clay	53	38
Clayton	10	28
Clinch	34	37
Cobb	7	31
Coffee	28	36
Colquitt	24	56
Columbia	13	33
Cook	24	27
Coweta	22	44
Crawford	22	53
Crisp	38	58
Dade	19	24
Dawson	23	17
De Kalb	12	34
Decatur	31	38
Dodge	33	38
Dooly	40	54
Dougherty	27	60
Douglas	9	37
Early	42	51
Echols	30	37
Effingham	20	44
Elbert	24	49
Emanuel	32	43
Evans	34	48
Fannin	25	18
Fayette	5	22
Floyd	15	55
Forsyth	12	16
Franklin	20	28
Fulton	29	64
Gilmer	22	20
Glascock	24	28
Glynn	21	39
Gordon	14	30
Grady	32	33
Greene	35	26
Gwinnett	5	21

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Habersham	15	12
Hall	12	32
Hancock	48	56
Haralson	17	34
Harris	20	38
Hart	19	24
Heard	20	34
Henry	12	59
Houston	15	40
Irwin	33	35
Jackson	14	35
Jasper	22	42
Jeff Davis	21	30
Jefferson	39	49
Jenkins	41	41
Johnson	35	32
Jones	19	43
Lamar	23	49
Lanier	36	37
Laurens	24	26
Lee	19	46
Liberty	26	33
Lincoln	26	35
Long	32	53
Lowndes	24	36
Lumpkin	18	32
Macon	43	51
Madison	18	25
Marion	36	45
McDuffie	23	43
McIntosh	40	46
Meriwether	24	47
Miller	33	41
Mitchell	39	45
Monroe	21	43
Montgomery	31	48
Morgan	29	33
Murray	18	10
Muscogee	24	44
Newton	18	39
Oconee	10	35
Oglethorpe	22	53
Paulding	12	39
Peach	34	43
Pickens	20	21
Pierce	26	29
Pike	19	31

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Polk	18	42
Pulaski	31	42
Putnam	24	46
Quitman	49	37
Rabun	18	20
Randolph	39	35
Richmond	23	53
Rockdale	9	42
Schley	29	51
Screven	41	35
Seminole	28	53
Spalding	23	34
Stephens	16	28
Stewart	45	58
Sumter	29	60
Talbot	27	45
Taliaferro	45	40
Tattnall	32	41
Taylor	39	61
Telfair	33	40
Terrell	40	39
Thomas	26	48
Tift	29	26
Toombs	32	35
Towns	27	16
Treutlen	36	43
Troup	21	41
Turner	43	30
Twiggs	21	78
Union	30	13
Upson	15	72
Walker	13	31
Walton	21	28
Ware	27	40
Warren	34	43
Washington	31	49
Wayne	22	51
Webster	37	41
Wheeler	38	40
White	15	11
Whitfield	14	25
Wilcox	37	40
Wilkes	23	55
Wilkinson	21	64
Worth	29	47
Hawaii:		
Hawaii	15	119
Honolulu	13	111

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Kauai	10	119
Maui	11	111
Idaho:		
Ada	9	52
Adams	18	22
Bannock	10	42
Bear Lake	11	15
Benewah	8	56
Bingham	17	23
Blaine	12	19
Boise	12	53
Bonner	19	40
Bonneville	9	32
Boundary	19	16
Butte	17	15
Camas	11	43
Canyon	19	35
Caribou	15	16
Cassia	18	20
Clark	15	22
Clearwater	10	46
Custer	23	7
Elmore	15	15
Franklin	15	8
Fremont	17	7
Gem	18	28
Gooding	22	19
Idaho	17	26
Jefferson	19	11
Jerome	17	24
Kootenai	14	46
Latah	12	30
Lemhi	21	25
Lewis	15	37
Lincoln	22	8
Madison	12	12
Minidoka	18	19
Nez Perce	13	60
Oneida	24	5
Owyhee	28	21
Payette	22	32
Power	14	33
Shoshone	10	78
Teton	20	7
Twin Falls	14	20
Valley	9	28

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Washington	26	28
Illinois:		
Adams	13	61
Alexander	36	81
Bond	14	35
Boone	7	44
Brown	15	21
Bureau	9	24
Calhoun	18	19
Carroll	13	35
Cass	10	52
Champaign	10	87
Christian	11	49
Clark	10	34
Clay	15	31
Clinton	11	21
Coles	11	37
Cook	20	119
Crawford	9	50
Cumberland	13	23
De Kalb	7	44
De Witt	11	25
Douglas	12	31
Du Page	3	44
Edgar	15	21
Edwards	12	29
Effingham	9	39
Fayette	15	43
Ford	9	60
Franklin	18	66
Fulton	13	60
Gallatin	18	51
Greene	22	40
Grundy	5	41
Hamilton	19	46
Hancock	12	40
Hardin	20	48
Henderson	11	44
Henry	8	46
Iroquois	11	43
Jackson	17	73
Jasper	10	28
Jefferson	16	75
Jersey	8	28

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Jo Daviess	8	14
Johnson	21	50
Kane	8	81
Kankakee	18	96
Kendall	5	23
Knox	10	52
La Salle	8	48
Lake	6	87
Lawrence	14	53
Lee	7	35
Livingston	9	34
Logan	9	41
Macon	14	66
Macoupin	11	62
Madison	13	101
Marion	14	61
Marshall	7	17
Mason	13	47
Massac	19	65
McDonough	14	34
McHenry	5	32
McLean	8	61
Menard	8	46
Mercer	11	35
Monroe	5	48
Montgomery	12	48
Morgan	12	60
Moultrie	9	23
Ogle	8	34
Peoria	13	84
Perry	10	65
Piatt	7	55
Pike	18	55
Pope	17	78
Pulaski	40	85
Putnam	6	17
Randolph	9	52
Richland	10	38
Rock Island	10	79
Saline	19	52
Sangamon	11	76
Schuyler	13	21
Scott	14	24
Shelby	13	35
St. Clair	26	112
Stark	9	23

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Stephenson	8	38
Tazewell	7	61
Union	17	59
Vermilion	14	66
Wabash	14	41
Warren	16	45
Washington	9	29
Wayne	16	49
White	13	69
Whiteside	8	50
Will	8	82
Williamson	13	51
Winnebago	10	77
Woodford	5	39
Indiana:		
Adams	14	10
Allen	11	65
Bartholomew	10	59
Benton	10	29
Blackford	12	23
Boone	8	28
Brown	13	35
Carroll	8	29
Cass	9	35
Clark	10	73
Clay	13	20
Clinton	12	25
Crawford	22	28
Daviess	21	17
De Kalb	7	29
Dearborn	9	45
Decatur	13	21
Delaware	14	63
Dubois	7	25
Elkhart	10	43
Fayette	14	22
Floyd	11	64
Fountain	8	17
Franklin	10	17
Fulton	11	19
Gibson	13	33
Grant	13	45
Greene	13	14
Hamilton	4	40

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Hancock	7	30
Harrison	9	18
Hendricks	4	31
Henry	12	47
Howard	9	43
Huntington	8	14
Jackson	9	52
Jasper	9	18
Jay	14	27
Jefferson	15	29
Jennings	14	25
Johnson	6	38
Knox	16	50
Kosciusko	10	19
La Porte	11	58
Lagrange	23	6
Lake	15	94
Lawrence	10	25
Madison	12	48
Marion	15	80
Marshall	10	26
Martin	14	31
Miami	10	24
Monroe	11	41
Montgomery	6	27
Morgan	10	48
Newton	10	24
Noble	10	15
Ohio	8	28
Orange	16	16
Owen	14	19
Parke	14	28
Perry	11	27
Pike	10	34
Porter	5	41
Posey	10	39
Pulaski	14	10
Putnam	10	18
Randolph	13	25
Ripley	11	22
Rush	13	16
Scott	17	40
Shelby	9	30
Spencer	11	24
St. Joseph	12	70
Starke	15	27
Steuben	10	16
Sullivan	12	33

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Switzerland	14	30
Tippecanoe	9	39
Tipton	5	39
Union	12	30
Vanderburgh	14	76
Vermilion	12	31
Vigo	13	46
Wabash	9	27
Warren	12	15
Warrick	8	33
Washington	18	16
Wayne	15	65
Wells	6	32
White	7	31
Whitley	6	13
Iowa:		
Adair	21	22
Adams	17	29
Allamakee	19	30
Appanoose	22	74
Audubon	20	25
Benton	14	33
Black Hawk	11	111
Boone	9	72
Bremer	7	56
Buchanan	14	42
Buena Vista	9	59
Butler	10	56
Calhoun	12	47
Carroll	10	28
Cass	13	38
Cedar	12	37
Cerro Gordo	10	78
Cherokee	12	40
Chickasaw	12	30
Clarke	22	28
Clay	9	55
Clayton	16	29

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Clinton	9	73
Crawford	12	40
Dallas	8	69
Davis	30	24
Decatur	22	41
Delaware	17	35
Des Moines	9	88
Dickinson	10	52
Dubuque	9	68
Emmet	16	37
Fayette	11	49
Floyd	9	72
Franklin	15	37
Fremont	22	28
Greene	17	38
Grundy	7	44
Guthrie	17	48
Hamilton	11	54
Hancock	8	51
Hardin	12	47
Harrison	18	56
Henry	9	67
Howard	18	21
Humboldt	10	45
Ida	17	21
Iowa	10	35
Jackson	16	30
Jasper	11	67
Jefferson	12	84
Johnson	7	48
Jones	11	47
Keokuk	14	38
Kossuth	14	29
Lee	11	86
Linn	7	107
Louisa	15	60
Lucas	20	52
Lyon	15	13
Madison	12	46
Mahaska	15	56
Marion	11	54
Marshall	9	87
Mills	10	62
Mitchell	13	26
Monona	18	45
Monroe	19	38
Montgomery	11	75
Muscatine	10	82

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
O'Brien	9	42
Osceola	12	31
Page	10	79
Palo Alto	14	43
Plymouth	14	22
Pocahontas	15	38
Polk	10	113
Pottawattamie	12	103
Poweshiek	13	32
Ringgold	31	30
Sac	14	30
Scott	9	106
Shelby	16	18
Sioux	12	18
Story	8	41
Tama	11	59
Taylor	24	35
Union	13	58
Van Buren	23	31
Wapello	12	94
Warren	6	64
Washington	18	27
Wayne	21	41
Webster	11	96
Winnebago	7	59
Winneshiek	17	13
Woodbury	14	85
Worth	10	59
Wright	12	58
Kansas:		
Allen	12	47
Anderson	16	21
Atchison	12	54
Barber	14	15
Barton	9	36
Bourbon	15	49
Brown	16	46
Butler	7	71
Chase	14	32
Chautauqua	15	46
Cherokee	17	60
Cheyenne	17	14

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Clark	7	52
Clay	14	44
Cloud	15	36
Coffey	14	32
Comanche	9	32
Cowley	9	69
Crawford	15	63
Decatur	16	15
Dickinson	15	48
Doniphan	15	63
Douglas	10	61
Edwards	10	47
Elk	17	30
Ellis	9	37
Ellsworth	11	36
Finney	11	47
Ford	9	74
Franklin	11	49
Geary	23	61
Gove	21	5
Graham	17	15
Grant	11	51
Gray	9	28
Greeley	14	36
Greenwood	12	61
Hamilton	12	30
Harper	17	24
Harvey	8	70
Haskell	14	23
Hodgeman	22	14
Jackson	10	54
Jefferson	8	41
Jewell	22	12
Johnson	4	65
Kearny	17	23
Kingman	10	38
Kiowa	14	17
Labette	13	75
Lane	8	31
Leavenworth	9	66
Lincoln	18	14
Linn	17	30
Logan	11	20
Lyon	8	52
Marion	13	23
Marshall	16	28

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
McPherson	9	28
Meade	10	24
Miami	7	65
Mitchell	10	33
Montgomery	13	66
Morris	17	30
Morton	12	46
Nemaha	21	13
Neosho	10	59
Ness	8	23
Norton	17	18
Osage	10	46
Osborne	20	31
Ottawa	11	34
Pawnee	7	47
Phillips	8	43
Pottawatomie	12	45
Pratt	9	49
Rawlins	17	17
Reno	10	48
Republic	14	25
Rice	10	49
Riley	14	28
Rooks	10	20
Rush	12	28
Russell	13	38
Saline	8	78
Scott	11	19
Sedgwick	12	80
Seward	12	56
Shawnee	9	101
Sheridan	19	5
Sherman	12	68
Smith	18	16
Stafford	13	23
Stanton	18	18
Stevens	7	50
Sumner	8	53
Thomas	9	29
Trego	10	26
Wabaunsee	9	32
Wallace	15	4
Washington	22	15
Wichita	19	39
Wilson	17	41

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Woodson	11	19
Wyandotte	19	106
Kentucky:		
Adair	33	35
Allen	20	28
Anderson	11	48
Ballard	14	52
Barren	21	36
Bath	32	38
Bell	39	49
Boone	8	57
Bourbon	24	45
Boyd	17	49
Boyle	18	42
Bracken	18	39
Breathitt	41	49
Breckinridge	26	46
Bullitt	11	44
Butler	21	37
Caldwell	13	52
Calloway	16	26
Campbell	13	78
Carlisle	20	41
Carroll	23	54
Carter	32	32
Casey	43	29
Christian	28	49
Clark	20	52
Clay	49	46
Clinton	50	27
Crittenden	21	25
Cumberland	35	42
Daviess	14	61
Edmonson	25	30
Elliott	37	30
Estill	34	44
Fayette	17	70
Fleming	26	31
Floyd	28	36
Franklin	12	63
Fulton	35	70
Gallatin	18	39
Garrard	24	27
Grant	14	39
Graves	15	48

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Grayson	25	35
Green	28	23
Greenup	15	50
Hancock	15	32
Hardin	17	32
Harlan	31	49
Harrison	23	44
Hart	32	42
Henderson	13	69
Henry	22	39
Hickman	21	66
Hopkins	17	39
Jackson	44	35
Jefferson	16	88
Jessamine	17	46
Johnson	27	45
Kenton	13	74
Knott	36	47
Knox	44	45
Larue	26	27
Laurel	25	41
Lawrence	35	38
Lee	41	48
Leslie	39	47
Letcher	34	36
Lewis	39	30
Lincoln	33	40
Livingston	14	38
Logan	16	67
Lyon	13	33
Madison	26	41
Magoffin	41	47
Marion	26	47
Marshall	10	30
Martin	31	38
Mason	23	34
McCracken	16	74
McCreary	46	35
McLean	15	45
Meade	15	28
Menifee	29	37
Mercer	20	31
Metcalfe	32	20
Monroe	31	41
Montgomery	27	41
Morgan	42	32

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Muhlenberg	17	51
Nelson	19	42
Nicholas	24	27
Ohio	18	40
Oldham	7	39
Owen	28	37
Owsley	58	44
Pendleton	21	34
Perry	27	39
Pike	23	31
Powell	30	51
Pulaski	26	36
Robertson	30	23
Rockcastle	38	36
Rowan	25	46
Russell	40	34
Scott	15	54
Shelby	15	50
Simpson	18	67
Spencer	23	34
Taylor	22	31
Todd	23	46
Trigg	16	50
Trimble	11	42
Union	11	52
Warren	16	41
Washington	28	35
Wayne	39	36
Webster	20	39
Whitley	32	43
Wolfe	38	57
Woodford	13	49
Louisiana:		
Acadia	26	36
Allen	24	43
Ascension	19	46
Assumption	24	35
Avoyelles	35	35
Beauregard	19	31
Bienville	29	35
Bossier	15	25
Caddo	21	46
Calcasieu	15	46
Caldwell	27	35

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Cameron	16	6
Catahoula	34	35
Claiborne	34	44
Concordia	35	44
De Soto	27	45
East Baton Rouge	18	51
East Carroll	52	66
East Feliciana	29	58
Evangeline	31	56
Franklin	36	54
Grant	24	31
Iberia	20	41
Iberville	29	58
Jackson	22	67
Jefferson	12	52
Jefferson Davis	22	30
La Salle	22	28
Lafayette	14	50
Lafourche	15	27
Lincoln	21	52
Livingston	15	24
Madison	54	54
Morehouse	40	50
Natchitoches	30	34
Orleans	38	69
Ouachita	27	40
Plaquemines	16	39
Pointe Coupee	31	53
Rapides	22	41
Red River	33	44
Richland	42	38
Sabine	26	29
St. Bernard	11	33
St. Charles	17	56
St. Helena	37	52
St. James	21	N/A

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
St. John The Baptist	17	96
St. Landry	32	52
St. Martin	24	38
St. Mary	20	44
St. Tammany	14	33
Tangipahoa	32	51
Tensas	51	55
Terrebonne	18	30
Union	24	30
Vermilion	19	27
Vernon	21	22
Washington	29	47
Webster	25	36
West Baton Rouge	21	60
West Carroll	34	29
West Feliciana	41	39
Winn	31	41
Maine:		
Androscoggin	16	87
Aroostook	19	64
Cumberland	13	105
Franklin	13	83
Hancock	17	64
Kennebec	14	80
Knox	17	81
Lincoln	21	50
Oxford	16	85
Penobscot	14	85
Piscataquis	18	66
Sagadahoc	14	66
Somerset	19	78
Waldo	24	63

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Washington	26	60
York	12	93
Maryland:		
Allegany	15	50
Anne Arundel	8	77
Baltimore	6	61
Baltimore City	32	134
Calvert	12	85
Caroline	14	78
Carroll	5	56
Cecil	9	73
Charles	10	74
Dorchester	18	78
Frederick	7	43
Garrett	17	42
Harford	9	76
Howard	4	37
Kent	14	59
Montgomery	5	73
Prince George's	8	92
Queen Anne's	11	65
Somerset	19	58
St. Mary's	12	63
Talbot	13	52
Washington	13	33
Wicomico	15	74
Worcester	16	37
Massachusetts:		
Barnstable	13	105
Berkshire	12	112
Bristol	14	118
Dukes	11	76
Essex	13	137
Franklin	12	91
Hampden	18	126
Hampshire	10	78
Middlesex	9	94

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Nantucket	5	140
Norfolk	7	102
Plymouth	10	128
Suffolk	29	150
Worcester	12	117
Michigan:		
Alcona	21	62
Alger	14	100
Allegan	10	105
Alpena	11	106
Antrim	11	86
Arenac	18	87
Baraga	11	120
Barry	10	98
Bay	11	105
Benzie	15	84
Berrien	19	109
Branch	14	76
Calhoun	14	135
Cass	13	93
Charlevoix	12	71
Cheboygan	18	70
Chippewa	17	91
Clare	21	91
Clinton	6	99
Crawford	15	107
Delta	13	76
Dickinson	8	92
Eaton	6	90
Emmet	11	75
Genesee	14	126
Gladwin	19	86
Gogebic	14	106
Grand Traverse	8	89
Gratiot	13	84
Hillsdale	12	84
Houghton	14	117
Huron	14	49
Ingham	13	139
Ionia	10	113
Iosco	14	77
Iron	15	87
Isabella	14	96
Jackson	12	111

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Kalamazoo	12	123
Kalkaska	17	90
Kent	11	114
Keweenaw	14	114
Lake	32	86
Lapeer	8	98
Leelanau	8	64
Lenawee	10	102
Livingston	5	96
Luce	14	89
Mackinac	17	87
Macomb	6	121
Manistee	12	83
Marquette	10	94
Mason	14	0
Mecosta	16	83
Menominee	9	105
Midland	9	115
Missaukee	16	79
Monroe	8	97
Montcalm	13	82
Montmorency	23	67
Muskegon	18	115
Newaygo	17	88
Oakland	7	111
Oceana	15	97
Ogemaw	20	86
Ontonagon	15	91
Osceola	17	79
Oscoda	19	76
Otsego	11	52
Ottawa	6	71
Presque Isle	17	45
Roscommon	13	119
Saginaw	16	123
Sanilac	13	89
Schoolcraft	17	80
Shiawassee	9	102
St. Clair	12	118
St. Joseph	13	90
Tuscola	10	97

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Van Buren	18	120
Washtenaw	9	119
Wayne	20	136
Wexford	15	85
Minnesota:		
Aitkin	21	39
Anoka	5	117
Becker	18	43
Beltrami	20	78
Benton	12	35
Big Stone	16	29
Blue Earth	10	68
Brown	11	37
Carlton	9	88
Carver	6	55
Cass	23	61
Chippewa	16	29
Chisago	7	80
Clay	8	66
Clearwater	23	62
Cook	12	54
Cottonwood	15	28
Crow Wing	19	37
Dakota	4	103
Dodge	10	38
Douglas	15	32
Fairbault	14	n/a
Fillmore	19	16
Freeborn	10	45
Goodhue	8	50
Grant	16	21
Hennepin	8	138
Houston	13	28
Hubbard	22	47
Isanti	7	59
Itasca	12	89
Jackson	18	22
Kanabec	18	40
Kandiyohi	10	49
Kittson	13	28
Koochiching	13	71
Lac qui Parle	18	13
Lake	4	120
Lake Of The Woods	20	25
Le Sueur	10	40
Lincoln	29	22
Lyon	13	n/a
Mahnomen	30	29
Marshall	18	18
Martin	10	34
McLeod	8	42
Meeker	15	29
Mille Lacs	11	72
Morrison	23	27
Mower	12	48
Murray	22	n/a
Nicollet	10	38
Nobles	15	33
Norman	19	15
Olmsted	5	86
Otter Tail	17	22
Pennington	12	41
Pine	16	56
Pipestone	24	15
Polk	13	54
Pope	20	22
Ramsey	10	128
Red Lake	21	10
Redwood	18	19
Renville	15	21
Rice	8	58
Rock	19	13
Roseau	17	22
Scott	5	72
Sherburne	8	66
Sibley	14	18
St. Louis	9	120
Stearns	11	36
Steele	8	35
Stevens	18	16
Swift	19	34
Todd	23	21
Traverse	22	18
Wabasha	11	34
Wadena	19	33
Waseca	8	52

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Washington	5	84
Watonwan	13	n/a
Wilkin	12	32
Winona	9	69
Wright	7	71
Yellow Medicine	20	18
Mississippi:		
Adams	36	62
Alcorn	20	26
Amite	34	31
Attala	38	35
Benton	31	51
Bolivar	52	59
Calhoun	27	46
Carroll	35	47
Chickasaw	24	43
Choctaw	32	47
Claiborne	40	61
Clarke	24	49
Clay	31	61
Coahoma	51	59
Copiah	35	56
Covington	35	50
De Soto	20	34
Forrest	26	47
Franklin	37	41
George	19	35
Greene	26	29
Grenada	29	62
Hancock	24	39
Harrison	22	45
Hinds	25	77
Holmes	59	80
Humphreys	56	57
Issaquena	45	61
Itawamba	15	16
Jackson	15	27
Jasper	33	45
Jefferson	51	67
Jefferson Davis	34	62
Jones	21	50
Kemper	45	29
Lafayette	19	51
Lamar	18	43
Lauderdale	28	57
Lawrence	22	48
Leake	37	37
Lee	19	36
Leflore	45	57
Lincoln	27	45
Lowndes	30	52
Madison	38	63
Marion	31	38
Marshall	40	58
Monroe	27	40
Montgomery	36	74
Neshoba	27	44
Newton	27	35
Noxubee	54	53
Oktibbeha	31	62
Panola	43	46
Pearl River	26	38
Perry	27	58
Pike	36	53
Pontotoc	21	34
Prentiss	16	28
Quitman	54	41
Rankin	14	17
Scott	33	30
Sharkey	52	71
Simpson	23	36
Smith	26	30
Stone	25	42
Sunflower	51	50
Tallahatchie	55	57
Tate	31	66
Tippah	25	44
Tishomingo	12	23
Tunica	63	58
Union	22	31
Walthall	35	66
Warren	24	69
Washington	42	59
Wayne	34	52
Webster	21	63
Wilkinson	45	59

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Winston	31	54
Yalobusha	30	44
Yazoo	47	59
Missouri:		
Adair	14	34
Andrew	9	1
Atchison	15	23
Audrain	15	31
Barry	15	38
Barton	17	18
Bates	18	32
Benton	19	33
Bollinger	23	34
Boone	8	63
Buchanan	14	60
Butler	28	52
Caldwell	15	25
Callaway	9	47
Camden	17	33
Cape Girardeau	11	52
Carroll	19	38
Carter	31	30
Cass	9	33
Cedar	18	33
Chariton	17	41
Christian	13	37
Clark	16	31
Clay	6	43
Clinton	8	42
Cole	6	50
Cooper	11	44
Crawford	20	39
Dade	16	26
Dallas	21	27
Daviess	23	19
De Kalb	18	15
Dent	22	44
Douglas	25	21
Dunklin	28	70
Franklin	10	41
Gasconade	13	23
Gentry	17	19
Greene	14	55
Grundy	20	21
Harrison	20	27
Henry	14	44

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Hickory	35	24
Holt	17	32
Howard	15	68
Howell	23	29
Iron	21	39
Jackson	14	95
Jasper	16	42
Jefferson	7	45
Johnson	12	33
Knox	30	11
Laclede	20	38
Lafayette	12	34
Lawrence	15	34
Lewis	14	37
Lincoln	12	27
Linn	15	45
Livingston	17	31
Macon	13	23
Madison	22	42
Maries	17	31
Marion	13	53
McDonald	25	31
Mercer	20	23
Miller	14	38
Mississippi	35	83
Moniteau	16	21
Monroe	20	23
Montgomery	15	40
Morgan	20	24
New Madrid	34	72
Newton	15	28
Nodaway	18	18
Oregon	34	23
Osage	11	16
Ozark	28	26
Pemiscot	46	75
Perry	12	28
Pettis	13	62
Phelps	12	51
Pike	22	31
Platte	5	48
Polk	18	28
Pulaski	16	29
Putnam	21	12
Ralls	8	37
Randolph	16	38

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Ray	9	44
Reynolds	26	26
Ripley	37	38
Saline	12	48
Schuyler	22	23
Scotland	23	7
Scott	20	63
Shannon	28	31
Shelby	19	24
St. Charles	5	51
St. Clair	24	40
St. Francois	17	50
St. Louis	6	82
St. Louis City	33	121
Ste. Genevieve	13	28
Stoddard	17	54
Stone	25	17
Sullivan	23	30
Taney	19	36
Texas	24	27
Vernon	14	52
Warren	12	0
Washington	23	54
Wayne	29	36
Webster	19	19
Worth	27	24
Wright	26	26
Montana:		
Beaverhead	13	35
Big Horn	24	26
Blaine	29	42
Broadwater	18	16
Carbon	12	28
Carter	33	4
Cascade	13	51
Chouteau	15	9
Custer	15	24
Daniels	18	9
Dawson	6	38
Deer Lodge	12	62
Fallon	22	12
Fergus	21	12
Flathead	10	40
Gallatin	10	23
Garfield	31	3
Glacier	29	54
Golden Valley	22	6
Granite	21	25
Hill	17	47
Jefferson	6	47
Judith Basin	27	10
Lake	22	24
Lewis And Clark	9	58
Liberty	18	7
Lincoln	11	61
Madison	15	13
McCone	25	0
Meagher	18	19
Mineral	15	29
Missoula	11	58
Musselshell	20	28
Park	8	54
Petroleum	45	5
Phillips	19	13
Pondera	15	52
Powder River	12	7
Powell	14	37
Prairie	39	1
Ravalli	16	24
Richland	12	25
Roosevelt	22	39
Rosebud	21	38
Sanders	10	57
Sheridan	16	13
Silver Bow	11	71
Stillwater	14	22
Sweet Grass	18	11
Teton	13	25
Toole	21	21
Treasure	26	13

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Valley	17	40
Wheatland	18	22
Wibaux	20	19
Yellowstone	11	50
Nebraska:		
Adams	8	47
Antelope	25	5
Arthur	26	0
Banner	30	11
Blaine	34	12
Boone	23	8
Box Butte	7	47
Boyd	26	13
Brown	22	7
Buffalo	8	37
Burt	20	21
Butler	12	8
Cass	8	32
Cedar	25	6
Chase	17	20
Cherry	17	16
Cheyenne	12	23
Clay	12	37
Colfax	15	11
Cuming	15	5
Custer	16	19
Dakota	10	0
Dawes	12	40
Dawson	10	39
Deuel	15	48
Dixon	23	13
Dodge	10	26
Douglas	12	93
Dundy	20	7
Fillmore	12	21
Franklin	19	21
Frontier	18	8
Furnas	22	12
Gage	11	45
Garden	14	4
Garfield	20	27
Gosper	15	22
Grant	16	9
Greeley	33	9
Hall	6	69
Hamilton	13	21
Harlan	21	24

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Hayes	26	2
Hitchcock	19	19
Holt	21	10
Hooker	24	16
Howard	10	32
Jefferson	19	18
Johnson	23	13
Kearney	11	10
Keith	9	53
Keya Paha	21	5
Kimball	13	28
Knox	25	9
Lancaster	8	74
Lincoln	8	58
Logan	30	11
Loup	12	30
Madison	8	36
McPherson	24	18
Merrick	13	24
Morrill	28	19
Nance	25	5
Nemaha	19	25
Nuckolls	9	26
Otoe	13	26
Pawnee	24	10
Perkins	20	11
Phelps	10	34
Pierce	15	9
Platte	9	14
Polk	16	6
Red Willow	11	14
Richardson	19	27
Rock	17	12
Saline	16	9
Sarpy	6	37
Saunders	11	21
Scotts Bluff	15	56
Seward	10	25
Sheridan	11	33
Sherman	24	8
Sioux	16	15
Stanton	19	3
Thayer	11	20
Thomas	9	7
Thurston	29	76

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Valley	22	10
Washington	8	26
Wayne	20	7
Webster	14	28
Wheeler	25	4
York	10	30
Nevada:		
Carson City	6	20
Churchill	12	22
Clark	11	42
Douglas	6	10
Elko	12	19
Esmeralda	2	100
Eureka	34	2
Humboldt	17	20
Lander	18	15
Lincoln	9	27
Lyon	10	22
Mineral	14	28
Nye	14	3
Pershing	15	12
Storey	7	29
Washoe	6	16
White Pine	12	29
New Hampshire:		
Belknap	12	53
Carroll	16	26
Cheshire	10	58
Coos	14	56
Grafton	11	52
Hillsborough	8	67
Merrimack	9	50
Rockingham	7	69
Strafford	10	69
Sullivan	14	40
New Jersey:		
Atlantic	18	174
Bergen	5	62
Burlington	8	105
Camden	18	127
Cape May	12	100
Cumberland	21	105
Essex	28	124
Gloucester	10	98
Hudson	27	106
Hunterdon	4	65
Mercer	13	160
Middlesex	8	128
Monmouth	10	118
Morris	4	62
Ocean	11	103
Passaic	21	106
Salem	16	86
Somerset	4	130
Sussex	6	69
Union	11	109
Warren	8	87
New Mexico:		
Bernalillo	16	52
Catron	24	14
Chaves	25	33
Colfax	19	46
Curry	20	50
De Baca	26	25
Dona Ana	28	26
Eddy	18	39
Grant	16	44
Guadalupe	35	42
Harding	22	19
Hidalgo	21	40
Lea	16	44
Lincoln	22	34
Los Alamos	4	6
Luna	28	30
McKinley	43	33
Mora	43	36
Otero	18	29
Quay	22	41
Rio Arriba	31	38
Roosevelt	33	36
San Juan	24	31

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
San Miguel	34	58
Sandoval	24	37
Santa Fe	15	51
Sierra	27	36
Socorro	33	34
Taos	31	44
Torrance	26	34
Union	27	26
Valencia	17	36
New York:		
Albany	12	84
Allegany	18	61
Bronx	42	n/a
Broome	10	70
Cattaraugus	16	47
Cayuga	15	55
Chautauqua	14	81
Chemung	14	66
Chenango	15	21
Clinton	14	58
Columbia	13	45
Cortland	14	65
Delaware	17	38
Dutchess	8	63
Erie	14	87
Essex	17	61
Franklin	20	55
Fulton	15	42
Genesee	12	41
Greene	15	41
Hamilton	18	37
Herkimer	17	32
Jefferson	17	43
Kings	37	n/a
Lewis	16	30
Livingston	11	50
Madison	15	38
Monroe	11	99
Montgomery	13	50
Nassau	7	81
New York	36	96
Niagara	12	77
Oneida	14	72
Onondaga	11	88

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Ontario	8	60
Orange	13	83
Orleans	12	70
Oswego	13	59
Otsego	16	40
Putnam	3	72
Queens	17	n/a
Rensselaer	13	60
Richmond	11	n/a
Rockland	8	75
Saratoga	10	41
Schenectady	11	72
Schoharie	15	41
Schuyler	12	36
Seneca	9	39
St. Lawrence	19	52
Steuben	16	50
Suffolk	8	81
Sullivan	18	52
Tioga	10	50
Tompkins	13	63
Ulster	12	78
Warren	16	39
Washington	16	45
Wayne	11	54
Westchester	10	117
Wyoming	11	25
Yates	19	25
North Carolina:		
Alamance	13	38
Alexander	8	35
Alleghany	20	28
Anson	18	36
Ashe	25	19
Avery	20	11
Beaufort	26	36
Bertie	36	33
Bladen	30	49
Brunswick	24	27
Buncombe	15	30
Burke	11	29

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Cabarrus	12	47
Caldwell	12	22
Camden	17	58
Carteret	16	42
Caswell	22	43
Catawba	9	39
Chatham	10	41
Cherokee	25	16
Chowan	30	33
Clay	25	12
Cleveland	16	59
Columbus	31	28
Craven	24	41
Cumberland	22	52
Currituck	21	23
Dare	12	35
Davidson	13	33
Davie	12	30
Duplin	26	42
Durham	17	85
Edgecombe	26	58
Forsyth	15	78
Franklin	24	38
Gaston	13	53
Gates	26	32
Graham	19	11
Granville	18	33
Greene	34	42
Guilford	14	68
Halifax	38	63
Harnett	24	41
Haywood	18	24
Henderson	13	31
Hertford	30	30
Hoke	26	34
Hyde	36	23
Iredell	12	42
Jackson	19	20
Johnston	20	28
Jones	24	67
Lee	17	33
Lenoir	25	45
Lincoln	11	32
Macon	16	7
Madison	28	25
Martin	31	23
McDowell	12	34

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Mecklenburg	14	79
Mitchell	18	26
Montgomery	16	36
Moore	17	38
Nash	26	45
New Hanover	19	52
Northampton	37	62
Onslow	21	19
Orange	11	43
Pamlico	25	35
Pasquotank	21	43
Pender	26	39
Perquimans	31	27
Person	21	44
Pitt	28	53
Polk	19	20
Randolph	10	15
Richmond	18	38
Robeson	31	51
Rockingham	15	40
Rowan	12	37
Rutherford	16	36
Sampson	25	34
Scotland	20	88
Stanly	12	37
Stokes	13	26
Surry	15	18
Swain	28	25
Transylvania	14	34
Tyrrell	26	55
Union	12	53
Vance	27	50
Wake	11	71
Warren	41	44
Washington	25	45
Watauga	18	23
Wayne	22	49
Wilkes	15	15
Wilson	27	38

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Yadkin	15	22
Yancey	27	11
North Dakota:		
Adams	19	12
Barnes	15	25
Benson	30	72
Billings	30	5
Bottineau	12	27
Bowman	15	15
Burke	23	16
Burleigh	8	40
Cass	8	55
Cavalier	14	26
Dickey	21	14
Divide	9	32
Dunn	29	17
Eddy	15	41
Emmons	28	4
Foster	13	36
Golden Valley	16	13
Grand Forks	11	28
Grant	42	6
Griggs	12	24
Hettinger	29	6
Kidder	34	14
La Moure	20	11
Logan	29	6
McHenry	18	24
McIntosh	31	10
McKenzie	17	29
McLean	13	45
Mercer	11	20
Morton	11	28
Mountrail	21	41
Nelson	17	19
Oliver	15	6
Pembina	13	52
Pierce	17	23
Ramsey	10	37
Ransom	14	30
Renville	22	10
Richland	10	30
Rolette	37	87
Sargent	10	28
Sheridan	31	14
Sioux	37	46
Slope	27	3

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Stark	13	12
Steele	13	20
Stutsman	13	36
Towner	20	28
Traill	8	25
Walsh	17	25
Ward	12	38
Wells	21	13
Williams	9	47
Ohio:		
Adams	27	60
Allen	13	71
Ashland	11	36
Ashtabula	11	74
Athens	21	64
Auglaize	7	43
Belmont	11	71
Brown	18	40
Butler	11	86
Carroll	11	46
Champaign	13	49
Clark	15	84
Clermont	10	56
Clinton	12	53
Columbiana	12	59
Coshocton	13	42
Crawford	14	51
Cuyahoga	16	114
Darke	11	38
Defiance	8	48
Delaware	7	53
Erie	10	69
Fairfield	8	50
Fayette	17	47
Franklin	15	103
Fulton	10	34
Gallia	16	61
Geauga	6	29
Greene	9	71
Guernsey	16	36
Hamilton	15	88
Hancock	7	53
Hardin	16	30
Harrison	13	41
Henry	6	50
Highland	18	41
Hocking	15	65

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Holmes	23	6
Huron	8	43
Jackson	20	85
Jefferson	13	87
Knox	14	45
Lake	5	59
Lawrence	18	76
Licking	9	76
Logan	12	47
Lorain	11	66
Lucas	15	96
Madison	11	61
Mahoning	16	94
Marion	14	75
Medina	5	27
Meigs	19	56
Mercer	8	40
Miami	9	61
Monroe	14	33
Montgomery	15	97
Morgan	17	58
Morrow	12	49
Muskingum	15	58
Noble	13	39
Ottawa	8	65
Paulding	7	52
Perry	15	64
Pickaway	13	48
Pike	26	54
Portage	9	71
Preble	10	51
Putnam	8	36
Richland	12	70
Ross	14	81
Sandusky	10	50
Scioto	23	86
Seneca	10	40
Shelby	10	50
Stark	11	75
Summit	13	98
Trumbull	11	80
Tuscarawas	11	64
Union	9	62
Van Wert	7	51
Vinton	20	54
Warren	9	63

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Washington	11	63
Wayne	12	32
Williams	9	32
Wood	8	46
Wyandot	13	39
Oklahoma:		
Adair	30	61
Alfalfa	14	24
Atoka	32	45
Beaver	18	2
Beckham	14	40
Blaine	19	33
Bryan	22	32
Caddo	25	47
Canadian	7	30
Carter	19	53
Cherokee	23	47
Choctaw	28	56
Cimarron	15	16
Cleveland	8	25
Coal	28	51
Comanche	18	36
Cotton	19	38
Craig	14	32
Creek	13	48
Custer	18	27
Delaware	28	41
Dewey	17	31
Ellis	9	20
Garfield	9	44
Garvin	14	36
Grady	15	30
Grant	14	11
Greer	31	43
Harmon	35	31
Harper	10	8
Haskell	20	62
Hughes	30	30
Jackson	22	46
Jefferson	21	19
Johnston	37	29
Kay	9	34
Kingfisher	11	17
Kiowa	27	36
Latimer	27	43
Le Flore	25	42
Lincoln	14	37

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Logan	15	28
Love	17	35
Major	10	9
Marshall	26	37
Mayes	17	35
McClain	10	37
McCurtain	28	54
McIntosh	29	45
Murray	17	34
Muskogee	23	50
Noble	11	45
Nowata	13	35
Okfuskee	24	56
Oklahoma	13	71
Okmulgee	24	58
Osage	11	45
Ottawa	20	37
Pawnee	16	31
Payne	13	22
Pittsburg	19	49
Pontotoc	18	32
Pottawatomie	15	46
Pushmataha	29	34
Roger Mills	15	29
Rogers	8	32
Seminole	23	58
Sequoyah	24	41
Stephens	11	27
Texas	8	22
Tillman	28	48
Tulsa	13	57
Wagoner	11	51
Washington	9	23
Washita	10	25
Woods	10	33
Woodward	9	12
Oregon:		
Baker	13	71
Benton	10	70
Clackamas	6	95
Clatsop	11	79
Columbia	10	85
Coos	12	121

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Crook	11	82
Curry	16	65
Deschutes	9	75
Douglas	13	82
Gilliam	8	206
Grant	14	64
Harney	9	73
Hood River	9	51
Jackson	14	90
Jefferson	16	45
Josephine	20	81
Klamath	13	71
Lake	18	42
Lane	13	104
Lincoln	12	90
Linn	15	84
Malheur	23	52
Marion	12	84
Morrow	13	47
Multnomah	13	120
Polk	13	65
Sherman	19	0
Tillamook	11	95
Umatilla	12	64
Union	11	69
Wallowa	13	54
Wasco	11	64
Washington	7	80
Wheeler	25	0
Yamhill	12	78
Pennsylvania:		
Adams	10	44
Allegheny	12	120
Armstrong	12	69
Beaver	10	78
Bedford	18	40
Berks	11	72
Blair	14	65
Bradford	16	78
Bucks	7	83
Butler	8	75
Cambria	13	49
Cameron	15	62
Carbon	10	52
Centre	11	51

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Chester	7	98
Clarion	13	53
Clearfield	13	59
Clinton	16	69
Columbia	13	60
Crawford	14	62
Cumberland	6	39
Dauphin	13	102
Delaware	10	108
Elk	7	71
Erie	13	92
Fayette	21	89
Forest	16	47
Franklin	8	51
Fulton	16	51
Greene	17	72
Huntingdon	17	60
Indiana	13	51
Jefferson	12	39
Juniata	17	35
Lackawanna	13	77
Lancaster	11	50
Lawrence	13	85
Lebanon	10	48
Lehigh	10	72
Luzerne	14	76
Lycoming	14	74
McKean	14	82
Mercer	12	70
Mifflin	17	59
Monroe	10	65
Montgomery	6	74
Montour	8	62
Northampton	10	79
Northumberland	14	50
Perry	10	59
Philadelphia	29	137
Pike	11	41
Potter	19	63
Schuylkill	14	47
Snyder	14	30
Somerset	15	54
Sullivan	13	25

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Susquehanna	17	46
Tioga	18	49
Union	10	40
Venango	10	95
Warren	11	58
Washington	12	81
Wayne	17	42
Westmoreland	9	86
Wyoming	12	81
York	8	73
Rhode Island:		
Bristol	7	92
Kent	9	103
Newport	13	82
Providence	16	111
Washington	8	98
South Carolina:		
Abbeville	18	66
Aiken	16	59
Allendale	38	85
Anderson	14	34
Bamberg	34	77
Barnwell	24	88
Beaufort	22	64
Berkeley	17	42
Calhoun	27	75
Charleston	23	62
Cherokee	17	46
Chester	24	40
Chesterfield	21	51
Clarendon	36	62
Colleton	32	57
Darlington	29	61
Dillon	38	48
Dorchester	14	54
Edgefield	34	38
Fairfield	26	60
Florence	28	1

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Georgetown	27	60
Greenville	14	42
Greenwood	17	46
Hampton	36	71
Horry	24	51
Jasper	34	69
Kershaw	19	5
Lancaster	13	44
Laurens	13	59
Lee	39	59
Lexington	11	34
Marion	33	45
Marlboro	31	17
McCormick	36	233
Newberry	13	76
Oconee	16	16
Orangeburg	34	65
Pickens	10	32
Richland	19	59
Saluda	27	43
Spartanburg	17	35
Sumter	29	55
Union	13	48
Williamsburg	34	2
York	14	42
South Dakota:		
Aurora	30	9
Beadle	15	36
Bennett	41	49
Bon Homme	27	15
Brookings	14	20
Brown	11	45
Brule	28	18
Buffalo	45	46
Butte	17	43
Campbell	37	2
Charles Mix	34	33
Clark	34	5
Clay	15	34
Codington	10	44
Corson	51	33

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Custer	17	23
Davison	15	45
Day	22	18
Deuel	27	6
Dewey	40	43
Douglas	34	7
Edmunds	31	8
Fall River	16	50
Faulk	40	4
Grant	14	18
Gregory	27	27
Haakon	23	11
Hamlin	32	6
Hand	38	3
Hanson	43	4
Harding	30	3
Hughes	7	97
Hutchinson	30	6
Hyde	28	19
Jackson	43	4
Jerauld	23	9
Jones	20	25
Kingsbury	28	11
Lake	16	24
Lawrence	14	43
Lincoln	11	26
Lyman	35	28
Marshall	30	15
McCook	21	19
McPherson	35	7
Meade	11	30
Mellette	50	49
Miner	35	7
Minnehaha	10	54
Moody	20	19
Pennington	14	68
Perkins	24	0
Potter	26	0
Roberts	32	29
Sanborn	41	10
Shannon	48	78
Spink	25	15
Stanley	14	54
Sully	25	6
Todd	50	64
Tripp	32	30

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Turner	16	18
Union	15	23
Walworth	16	45
Yankton	10	55
Ziebach	49	48
Tennessee:		
Anderson	18	42
Bedford	14	35
Benton	17	31
Bledsoe	27	26
Blount	16	34
Bradley	16	21
Campbell	31	32
Cannon	23	11
Carroll	19	34
Carter	24	25
Cheatham	13	26
Chester	19	37
Claiborne	35	24
Clay	29	35
Cocke	33	31
Coffee	17	20
Crockett	25	41
Cumberland	28	0
Davidson	17	59
De Kalb	25	19
Decatur	18	21
Dickson	12	32
Dyer	18	45
Fayette	38	50
Fentress	38	15
Franklin	20	2
Gibson	23	40
Giles	20	28
Grainger	25	25
Greene	20	22
Grundy	30	23
Hamblen	19	28
Hamilton	18	52
Hancock	49	36
Hardeman	33	57
Hardin	21	32
Hawkins	19	22
Haywood	43	42
Henderson	20	25
Henry	17	30
Hickman	11	53
Houston	18	46
Humphreys	14	37
Jackson	26	19
Jefferson	20	27
Johnson	31	27
Knox	18	48
Lake	42	49
Lauderdale	28	49
Lawrence	19	16
Lewis	20	19
Lincoln	20	25
Loudon	15	30
Macon	14	23
Madison	23	51
Marion	20	36
Marshall	11	43
Maury	18	34
McMinn	18	18
McNairy	20	28
Meigs	13	39
Monroe	24	26
Montgomery	15	32
Moore	20	7
Morgan	29	35
Obion	18	31
Overton	29	17
Perry	15	34
Pickett	36	21
Polk	22	22
Putnam	17	17
Rhea	23	33
Roane	15	42
Robertson	15	44
Rutherford	11	36
Scott	35	39
Sequatchie	25	34
Sevier	17	24
Shelby	27	64
Smith	13	26
Stewart	18	29
Sullivan	15	30
Sumner	10	35
Tipton	24	51
Trousdale	8	59

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Unicoi	18	32
Union	29	32
Van Buren	20	16
Warren	19	19
Washington	17	27
Wayne	18	22
Weakley	15	28
White	22	15
Williamson	9	55
Wilson	12	30
Texas:		
Anderson	21	24
Andrews	15	5
Angelina	16	21
Aransas	21	16
Archer	8	7
Armstrong	8	0
Atascosa	29	27
Austin	17	24
Bailey	27	11
Bandera	12	16
Bastrop	21	24
Baylor	6	46
Bee	30	28
Bell	20	17
Bexar	25	35
Blanco	7	11
Borden	25	3
Bosque	17	14
Bowie	21	2
Brazoria	9	15
Brazos	15	27
Brewster	23	21
Briscoe	36	13
Brooks	34	35
Brown	14	14
Burleson	20	51
Burnet	22	17
Caldwell	26	26
Calhoun	18	33
Callahan	11	11
Cameron	41	23
Camp	18	35
Carson	10	3
Cass	20	34
Castro	39	6
Chambers	17	25
Cherokee	20	23
Childress	16	19
Clay	12	11
Cochran	34	13
Coke	12	0
Coleman	21	31
Collin	7	19
Collingsworth	35	12
Colorado	22	32
Comal	13	15
Comanche	15	0
Concho	27	8
Cooke	12	15
Coryell	16	8
Cottle	32	21
Crane	16	7
Crockett	11	16
Crosby	38	7
Culberson	19	10
Dallam	22	8
Dallas	14	33
Dawson	32	21
De Witt	29	28
Deaf Smith	25	21
Delta	25	45
Denton	6	18
Dickens	40	14
Dimmit	43	31
Donley	24	12
Duval	31	35
Eastland	17	14
Ector	14	14
Edwards	47	15
El Paso	29	16
Ellis	14	34
Erath	15	6
Falls	25	35
Fannin	15	40
Fayette	15	24
Fisher	18	29
Floyd	39	12
Foard	21	36
Fort Bend	10	24
Franklin	16	3
Freestone	15	32
Frio	40	31

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Gaines	27	10
Galveston	12	33
Garza	20	29
Gillespie	19	0
Glasscock	30	7
Goliad	21	28
Gonzales	30	28
Gray	10	16
Grayson	9	28
Gregg	15	35
Grimes	31	33
Guadalupe	20	17
Hale	28	15
Hall	36	18
Hamilton	15	0
Hansford	12	8
Hardeman	26	22
Hardin	13	35
Harris	13	32
Harrison	21	53
Hartley	10	4
Haskell	27	25
Hays	17	26
Hemphill	8	4
Henderson	14	31
Hidalgo	45	23
Hill	16	35
Hockley	26	14
Hood	10	11
Hopkins	15	24
Houston	28	41
Howard	21	25
Hudspeth	36	5
Hunt	18	27
Hutchinson	7	15
Irion	9	27
Jack	10	5
Jackson	15	62
Jasper	18	38
Jeff Davis	33	20
Jefferson	17	31
Jim Hogg	20	33
Jim Wells	25	37
Johnson	8	28
Jones	19	29
Karnes	31	30

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Kaufman	18	30
Kendall	15	15
Kenedy	35	7
Kent	23	2
Kerr	18	25
Kimble	18	23
King	30	0
Kinney	45	18
Kleberg	27	34
Knox	30	30
La Salle	45	30
Lamar	24	40
Lamb	33	16
Lampasas	21	13
Lavaca	14	25
Lee	15	25
Leon	26	31
Liberty	15	31
Limestone	26	4
Lipscomb	13	3
Live Oak	20	16
Llano	17	10
Loving	0	n/a
Lubbock	17	16
Lynn	37	12
Madison	25	30
Marion	36	32
Martin	22	18
Mason	29	4
Matagorda	15	28
Maverick	46	16
McCulloch	25	22
McLennan	20	33
McMullen	12	39
Medina	28	20
Menard	35	7
Midland	11	3
Milam	22	32
Mills	27	6
Mitchell	29	13
Montague	12	15
Montgomery	8	24
Moore	12	12
Morris	15	64
Motley	44	7

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Nacogdoches	20	23
Navarro	22	27
Newton	24	30
Nolan	18	19
Nueces	22	35
Ochiltree	10	8
Oldham	6	9
Orange	12	26
Palo Pinto	12	21
Panola	15	34
Parker	10	13
Parmer	29	5
Pecos	22	11
Polk	23	31
Potter	16	16
Presidio	46	6
Rains	15	19
Randall	5	3
Reagan	23	4
Real	53	14
Red River	33	29
Reeves	29	14
Refugio	24	34
Roberts	12	6
Robertson	32	0
Rockwall	8	24
Runnels	25	12
Rusk	16	38
Sabine	22	34
San Augustine	33	32
San Jacinto	27	37
San Patricio	22	30
San Saba	32	11
Schleicher	16	9
Scurry	15	23
Shackelford	12	24
Shelby	24	38
Sherman	10	9
Smith	16	30
Somervell	9	18
Starr	58	14
Stephens	16	16
Sterling	17	0
Stonewall	18	12

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Sutton	17	5
Swisher	35	9
Tarrant	11	29
Taylor	13	2
Terrell	20	8
Terry	31	24
Throckmorton	25	0
Titus	13	19
Tom Green	13	29
Travis	15	27
Trinity	21	55
Tyler	16	29
Upshur	14	43
Upton	27	7
Uvalde	37	24
Val Verde	38	16
Van Zandt	13	24
Victoria	17	30
Walker	20	43
Waller	17	47
Ward	15	14
Washington	18	48
Webb	40	19
Wharton	19	28
Wheeler	14	19
Wichita	15	22
Wilbarger	26	16
Willacy	42	24
Williamson	10	27
Wilson	18	35
Winkler	11	13
Wise	15	11
Wood	15	21
Yoakum	21	10
Young	12	12
Zapata	35	25
Zavala	44	36
Utah:		
Beaver	18	24
Box Elder	9	34
Cache	11	19
Carbon	7	84
Daggett	14	25
Davis	6	37

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Duchesne	13	26
Emery	8	30
Garfield	11	20
Grand	11	46
Iron	13	19
Juab	17	25
Kane	20	7
Millard	17	20
Morgan	7	14
Piute	9	55
Rich	16	5
Salt Lake	10	1
San Juan	36	65
Sanpete	17	25
Sevier	12	1
Summit	10	21
Tooele	10	42
Uintah	14	15
Utah	12	33
Wasatch	11	34
Washington	18	17
Wayne	24	13
Weber	10	68
Vermont:		
Addison	14	51
Bennington	10	91
Caledonia	17	62
Chittenden	9	98
Essex	19	2
Franklin	18	73
Grand Isle	14	46
Lamoille	15	80
Orange	16	46
Orleans	22	34
Rutland	14	61
Washington	14	59
Windham	15	61
Windsor	12	72
Virginia:		
Accomack	28	51
Albemarle	10	48
Alexandria	15	98
Alleghany	10	25

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Amelia	10	61
Amherst	12	25
Appomattox	10	63
Arlington	10	57
Augusta	12	25
Bath	15	8
Bedford	9	33
Bedford City	22	n/a
Bland	14	18
Botetourt	7	60
Bristol	21	31
Brunswick	29	33
Buchanan	22	27
Buckingham	23	43
Buena Vista	9	70
Campbell	11	43
Caroline	22	38
Carroll	16	21
Charles City	18	93
Charlotte	33	32
Charlottesville	15	94
Chesapeake	14	59
Chesterfield	5	37
Clarke	10	37
Clifton Forge	24	15
Colonial Heights	5	57
Covington	15	48
Craig	10	15
Culpeper	17	35
Cumberland	27	41
Danville	19	55
Dickenson	20	29
Dinwiddie	15	55
Emporia	21	79
Essex	19	28
Fairfax	5	51
Fairfax City	6	n/a

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Falls Church	4	25
Fauquier	12	26
Floyd	12	24
Fluvanna	24	34
Franklin	29	39
Franklin	12	79
Frederick	11	19
Fredericksburg	14	92
Galax	23	33
Giles	16	26
Gloucester	14	34
Goochland	16	46
Grayson	14	26
Greene	12	45
Greensville	28	52
Halifax	24	40
Hampton	17	70
Hanover	8	41
Harrisonburg	14	40
Henrico	7	31
Henry	12	23
Highland	15	14
Hopewell	16	55
Isle Of Wight	18	55
James City	13	51
King And Queen	22	48
King George	12	49
King William	16	47
Lancaster	20	68
Lee	30	27
Lexington	21	36
Loudoun	7	36
Louisa	19	42
Lunenburg	23	20
Lynchburg	17	52
Madison	17	34
Manassas	9	46

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Manassas Park	8	95
Martinsville	18	56
Mathews	11	60
Mecklenburg	25	12
Middlesex	24	17
Montgomery	11	51
Nelson	22	40
New Kent	9	42
Newport News	19	73
Norfolk	30	77
Northampton	32	65
Northumberland	14	65
Norton	25	29
Nottoway	24	42
Orange	18	36
Page	19	26
Patrick	12	21
Petersburg	30	86
Pittsylvania	19	29
Poquoson	6	n/a
Portsmouth	28	74
Powhatan	11	36
Prince Edward	28	45
Prince George	10	28
Prince William	5	59
Pulaski	13	33
Radford	13	27
Rappahannock	14	36
Richmond	29	100
Richmond County	19	42
Roanoke	24	74
Roanoke County	7	44
Rockbridge	16	25

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Rockingham	11	24
Russell	15	35
Salem	10	n/a
Scott	24	19
Shenandoah	14	23
Smyth	17	27
South Boston	20	n/a
Southampton	28	49
Spotsylvania	12	36
Stafford	8	31
Staunton	11	43
Suffolk	23	64
Surry	29	49
Sussex	25	62
Tazewell	17	31
Virginia Beach	13	29
Warren	11	33
Washington	17	21
Waynesboro	13	50
Westmoreland	26	50
Williamsburg	4	194
Winchester	21	41
Wise	19	26
Wythe	18	26
York	9	33
Washington:		
Adams	15	55
Asotin	20	65
Benton	8	31
Chelan	14	67
Clallam	12	81
Clark	10	64
Columbia	12	75
Cowlitz	13	72
Douglas	12	41
Ferry	19	29
Franklin	18	43
Garfield	9	25

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Grant	17	45
Grays Harbor	12	81
Island	13	28
Jefferson	17	64
King	8	91
Kitsap	10	59
Kittitas	15	57
Klickitat	12	59
Lewis	13	61
Lincoln	10	41
Mason	12	77
Okanogan	19	51
Pacific	12	67
Pend Oreille	18	83
Pierce	13	86
San Juan	13	21
Skagit	13	73
Skamania	10	54
Snohomish	8	81
Spokane	13	67
Stevens	17	35
Thurston	11	65
Wahkiakum	13	56
Walla Walla	14	66
Whatcom	12	60
Whitman	10	25
Yakima	19	65
West Virginia:		
Barbour	24	48
Berkeley	18	43
Boone	18	64
Braxton	27	46
Brooke	13	69
Cabell	16	66
Calhoun	34	38
Clay	37	35
Doddridge	27	33
Fayette	22	78
Gilmer	20	43
Grant	25	44
Greenbrier	16	31
Hampshire	19	66

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Hancock	9	94
Hardy	22	42
Harrison	18	55
Jackson	13	32
Jefferson	17	60
Kanawha	13	53
Lewis	19	65
Lincoln	29	48
Logan	21	47
Marion	16	62
Marshall	12	72
Mason	15	34
McDowell	31	78
Mercer	19	62
Mineral	16	68
Mingo	30	69
Monongalia	11	40
Monroe	25	15
Morgan	21	25
Nicholas	21	47
Ohio	14	82
Pendleton	26	39
Pleasants	15	37
Pocahontas	13	56
Preston	22	44
Putnam	11	42
Raleigh	16	66
Randolph	21	45
Ritchie	22	30
Roane	20	46
Summers	28	61
Taylor	19	59
Tucker	20	32
Tyler	17	35
Upshur	19	46
Wayne	23	35
Webster	36	52
Wetzel	13	55
Wirt	19	26
Wood	14	49
Wyoming	23	61
Wisconsin:		
Adams	16	63
Ashland	14	76
Barron	14	71
Bayfield	16	68
Brown	8	101
Buffalo	18	41
Burnett	18	100
Calumet	5	83
Chippewa	12	83
Clark	21	30
Columbia	9	93
Crawford	18	45
Dane	7	106
Dodge	7	71
Door	8	50
Douglas	12	147
Dunn	13	75
Eau Claire	10	113
Florence	16	69
Fond du Lac	7	96
Forest	21	75
Grant	12	39
Green	11	64
Green Lake	9	71
Iowa	15	33
Iron	17	67
Jackson	16	72
Jefferson	7	66
Juneau	14	66
Kenosha	9	122
Kewaunee	7	45
La Crosse	8	107
Lafayette	14	33
Langlade	17	77
Lincoln	11	57
Manitowoc	6	97
Marathon	9	68
Marinette	10	110
Marquette	13	68
Menominee	22	187
Milwaukee	16	131
Monroe	12	65
Oconto	13	55
Oneida	11	90
Outagamie	7	84
Ozaukee	4	74
Pepin	9	87
Pierce	10	54

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Polk	12	85
Portage	10	74
Price	15	46
Racine	10	139
Richland	14	74
Rock	9	124
Rusk	18	48
Sauk	11	88
Sawyer	20	83
Shawano	13	53
Sheboygan	6	89
St. Croix	7	74
Taylor	13	39
Trempealeau	15	59
Vernon	16	37
Vilas	14	70
Walworth	8	72
Washburn	13	88
Washington	5	91
Waukesha	3	87
Waupaca	10	75
Waushara	13	67
Winnebago	7	122
Wood	8	85

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

State and County	Percent of Children In Poverty	Percent of Children Receiving AFDC
Wyoming:		
Albany	10	34
Big Horn	15	20
Campbell	4	26
Carbon	6	44
Converse	5	41
Crook	13	23
Fremont	10	27
Goshen	12	45
Hot Springs	7	33
Johnson	5	18
Laramie	9	63
Lincoln	14	12
Natrona	6	61
Niobrara	15	32
Park	8	38
Platte	9	24
Sheridan	4	55
Sublette	11	3
Sweetwater	5	32
Teton	4	25
Uinta	3	69
Washakie	7	42
Weston	10	24

TABLE F-5

1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

- ALABAMA:
  - Macon
  - Pickens
  - Sumter
  - Wilcox
- ALASKA
- ARKANSAS:
  - Dallas
  - Phillips
- CALIFORNIA:
  - Alameda
  - Butte
  - Calaveras
  - Contra Costa
  - Del Norte
  - El Dorado
  - Fresno
  - Humboldt
  - Imperial
  - Inyo
  - Kern
  - Kings
  - Lake
  - Lassen
  - Los Angeles
  - Madera
  - Marin
  - Mendocino
  - Merced
  - Modoc
  - Monterey
  - Napa
  - Nevada
  - Orange
  - Placer
  - Plumas
  - Riverside
  - Sacramento
  - San Bernardino
  - San Diego
  - San Francisco
  - San Joaquin
  - San Luis Obispo
  - San Mateo
  - Santa Barbara
  - Santa Clara
  - Santa Cruz
  - Shasta
  - Sierra
  - Siskiyou
  - Solano
  - Sonoma
  - Stanislaus
- CALIFORNIA—Cont.
  - Sutter
  - Tehama
  - Trinity
  - Tulare
  - Ventura
  - Yolo
  - Yuba
- COLORADO:
  - Adams
  - Bent
  - Chaffee
  - Crowley
  - Denver
  - Fremont
  - Lake
  - Las Animas
  - Otero
  - Pueblo
- CONNECTICUT:
  - Fairfield
  - Hartford
  - Litchfield
  - Middlesex
  - New Haven
  - New London
  - Tolland
  - Windham
- DELAWARE:
  - Kent
- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
  - Washington
- GEORGIA:
  - Fulton
  - Twiggs
  - Upson
  - Wilkinson
- HAWAII:
  - Hawaii
  - Honolulu
  - Kauai
  - Maui
- IDAHO:
  - Shoshone
- ILLINOIS:
  - Alexander
  - Champaign
  - Cook
- ILLINOIS—Cont.
  - Franklin
  - Jackson
  - Jefferson
  - Kane
  - Kankakee
  - Lake
  - Macon
  - Madison
  - Massac
  - Peoria
  - Perry
  - Pope
  - Pulaski
  - Rock Island
  - Sangamon
  - St. Clair
  - Vermilion
  - White
  - Will
  - Winnebago
- INDIANA:
  - Allen
  - Clark
  - Floyd
  - Lake
  - Marion
  - St. Joseph
  - Vanderburgh
  - Wayne
- IOWA:
  - Appanoose
  - Black Hawk
  - Boone
  - Cerro Gordo
  - Clinton
  - Dallas
  - Des Moines
  - Dubuque
  - Floyd
  - Henry
  - Jasper
  - Jefferson
  - Lee
  - Linn
  - Marshall
  - Montgomery
  - Muscatine
  - Page
  - Polk
  - Pottawattamie
  - Scott
  - Wapello
  - Warren

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

IOWA—Cont.
- Webster
- Woodbury

KANSAS:
- Butler
- Cowley
- Crawford
- Doniphan
- Ford
- Harvey
- Johnson
- Labette
- Leavenworth
- Miami
- Montgomery
- Saline
- Sedgwick
- Shawnee
- Sherman
- Wyandotte

KENTUCKY:
- Campbell
- Fayette
- Fulton
- Franklin
- Henderson
- Hickman
- Jefferson
- Kenton
- Logan
- McCracken
- Simpson

LOUISIANA:
- East Carroll
- Jackson
- Orleans
- St. John The Baptist

MAINE:
- Androscoggin
- Aroostook
- Cumberland
- Franklin
- Hancock
- Kennebec
- Knox
- Oxford
- Penobscot
- Piscataquis
- Sagadahoc
- Somerset
- York

MARYLAND:
- Anne Arundel
- Baltimore City
- Calvert
- Caroline
- Cecil
- Charles
- Dorchester
- Harford
- Montgomery
- Prince George's
- Queen Anne's
- Wicomico

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Barnstable
- Berkshire
- Bristol
- Dukes
- Essex
- Franklin
- Hampden
- Hampshire
- Middlesex
- Nantucket
- Norfolk
- Plymouth
- Suffolk
- Worcester

MICHIGAN:
- Alger
- Allegan
- Alpena
- Antrim
- Arenac
- Baraga
- Barry
- Bay
- Benzie
- Berrien
- Branch
- Calhoun
- Cass
- Charlevoix
- Cheboygan
- Chippewa
- Clare
- Clinton
- Crawford
- Delta
- Dickinson
- Eaton
- Emmet
- Genesee
- Gladwin

MICHIGAN—Cont.
- Gogebic
- Grand Traverse
- Gratiot
- Hillsdale
- Houghton
- Ingham
- Ionia
- Iosco
- Iron
- Isabella
- Jackson
- Kalamazoo
- Kalkaska
- Kent
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Lapeer
- Leelanau
- Lenawee
- Livingston
- Luce
- Mackinac
- Macomb
- Manistee
- Marquette
- Mason
- Mecosta
- Menominee
- Midland
- Missaukee
- Monroe
- Montcalm
- Montmorency
- Muskegon
- Newaygo
- Oakland
- Oceana
- Ogemaw
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Ottawa
- Roscommon
- Saginaw
- Sanilac
- Schoolcraft
- Shiawassee
- St. Clair
- St. Joseph
- Tuscola
- Van Buren
- Washtenaw
- Wayne
- Wexford

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

MINNESOTA:
- Anoka
- Beltrami
- Blue Earth
- Carlton
- Chisago
- Clay
- Dakota
- Hennepin
- Itasca
- Koochiching
- Lake
- Mille Lacs
- Olmsted
- Ramsey
- Scott
- Sherburne
- St. Louis
- Washington
- Winona
- Wright

MISSISSIPPI:
- Hinds
- Holmes
- Jefferson
- Madison
- Montgomery
- Sharkey
- Tate
- Walthall
- Warren

MISSOURI:
- Boone
- Dunklin
- Howard
- Jackson
- Mississippi
- New Madrid
- Pemiscot
- Scott
- St. Louis
- St. Louis City

MONTANA:
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Douglas
- Hall
- Lancaster
- Thurston

NEVADA:
- Esmeralda

NEW HAMPSHIRE:
- Hillsborough
- Rockingham
- Strafford

NEW JERSEY:
- Atlantic
- Burlington
- Camden
- Cape May
- Cumberland
- Essex
- Gloucester
- Hudson
- Hunterdon
- Mercer
- Middlesex
- Monmouth
- Ocean
- Passaic
- Salem
- Somerset
- Sussex
- Union
- Warren

NEW YORK:
- Albany
- Broome
- Chautauqua
- Chemung
- Cortland
- Erie
- Monroe
- Nassau
- New York
- Niagara
- Oneida
- Onondaga
- Orange
- Orleans
- Putnam
- Rockland
- Schenectady
- Suffolk
- Ulster
- Westchester

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Durham
- Forsyth
- Guilford
- Jones
- Mecklenburg
- Scotland
- Wake

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Benson
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Allen
- Ashtabula
- Athens
- Belmont
- Butler
- Clark
- Cuyahoga
- Erie
- Franklin
- Greene
- Hamilton
- Hocking
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Lawrence
- Licking
- Lorain
- Lucas
- Mahoning
- Marion
- Montgomery
- Ottawa
- Perry
- Portage
- Richland
- Ross
- Scioto
- Stark
- Summit
- Trumbull
- Tuscarawas
- Warren

OKLAHOMA:
- Oklahoma

OREGON:
- Baker
- Benton
- Clackamas
- Clatsop
- Columbia
- Coos
- Crook
- Curry
- Deschutes
- Douglas
- Gilliam
- Grant
- Harney
- Jackson

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

OREGON—Cont.
- Josephine
- Klamath
- Lane
- Lincoln
- Linn
- Marion
- Multnomah
- Polk
- Tillamook
- Umatilla
- Union
- Wasco
- Washington
- Yamhill

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Allegheny
- Armstrong
- Beaver
- Berks
- Blair
- Bradford
- Bucks
- Butler
- Chester
- Clinton
- Dauphin
- Delaware
- Elk
- Erie
- Fayette
- Greene
- Lackawanna
- Lawrence
- Lehigh
- Luzerne
- Lycoming
- McKean
- Mercer
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Northampton
- Philadelphia
- Venango
- Washington
- Westmoreland
- Wyoming
- York

RHODE ISLAND:
- Bristol
- Kent
- Newport
- Providence
- Washington

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Abbeville
- Allendale
- Bamberg
- Barnwell
- Beaufort
- Calhoun
- Hampton
- Jasper
- McCormick
- Newberry
- Orangeburg

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Hughes
- Pennington
- Shannon
- Todd

TENNESSEE:
- Shelby

TEXAS:
- Morris

UTAH:
- Carbon
- San Juan
- Weber

VERMONT:
- Bennington
- Chittenden
- Franklin
- Lamoille
- Windsor

VIRGINIA:
- Alexandria
- Buena Vista
- Charles City
- Charlottesville
- Emporia
- Franklin
- Fredericksburg
- Hampton
- Lancaster
- Manassas Park
- Newport News
- Norfolk
- Northampton
- Northumberland
- Petersburg
- Portsmouth
- Richmond City
- Roanoke

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Suffolk
- Williamsburg

WASHINGTON:
- Asotin
- Chelan
- Clallam
- Clark
- Columbia
- Cowlitz
- Grays Harbor
- Jefferson
- King
- Mason
- Pacific
- Pend Oreille
- Pierce
- Skagit
- Snohomish
- Spokane
- Thurston
- Walla Walla
- Yakima

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Boone
- Brooke
- Cabell
- Fayette
- Hampshire
- Hancock
- Lewis
- Marshall
- McDowell
- Mineral
- Mingo
- Ohio
- Raleigh

WISCONSIN:
- Adams
- Ashland
- Barron
- Bayfield
- Brown
- Burnett
- Calumet
- Chippewa
- Columbia
- Dane
- Dodge
- Douglas
- Dunn
- Eau Claire
- Florence

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Fond du Lac
- Forest
- Green
- Green Lake
- Iron
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Juneau
- Kenosha
- La Crosse
- Langlade
- Manitowoc
- Marathon
- Marinette

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Marquette
- Menominee
- Milwaukee
- Monroe
- Oneida
- Outagamie
- Ozaukee
- Pepin
- Polk
- Portage
- Racine
- Richland
- Rock
- Sauk

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Sawyer
- Sheboygan
- St. Croix
- Vilas
- Walworth
- Washburn
- Washington
- Waukesha
- Waupaca
- Waushara
- Winnebago
- Wood

WYOMING:
- Uinta

TABLE F-6

1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

ALABAMA:
Blount
Cherokee
Cullman
Dale
De Kalb
Winston

ARIZONA:
Cochise
Mohave
Navajo
Santa Cruz
Yavapai
Yuma

ARKANSAS:
Baxter
Boone
Carroll
Cleburne
Crawford
Faulkner
Franklin
Fulton
Grant
Izard
Logan
Madison
Marion
Montgomery
Newton
Randolph
Searcy
Sevier

COLORADO:
Baca
Cheyenne
Douglas
Eagle
Gilpin
Gunnison
Hinsdale
Kit Carson
Park
Phillips
Pitkin
San Miguel
Summit
Teller
Washington
Yuma

FLORIDA:
Clay
Collier

FLORIDA—Cont.
Gilchrist
Hardee
Lafayette
Suwannee

GEORGIA:
Banks
Brantley
Chattahoochee
Cherokee
Dawson
Fannin
Fayette
Forsyth
Gilmer
Gwinnett
Habersham
Murray
Pickens
Rabun
Towns
Union
White

IDAHO:
Adams
Bear Lake
Bingham
Blaine
Boundary
Butte
Caribou
Cassia
Clark
Custer
Elmore
Franklin
Fremont
Gooding
Jefferson
Jerome
Lincoln
Madison
Minidoka
Oneida
Owyhee
Teton
Twin Falls

ILLINOIS:
Brown
Bureau
Calhoun
Clinton
Cumberland

ILLINOIS—Cont.
Edgar
Jo Daviess
Kendall
Marshall
Moultrie
Putnam
Schuyler
Scott
Stark

INDIANA:
Adams
Blackford
Clay
Daviess
Decatur
Fayette
Fountain
Franklin
Fulton
Greene
Harrison
Huntington
Jasper
Kosciusko
Lagrange
Newton
Noble
Orange
Owen
Pulaski
Putnam
Ripley
Rush
Spencer
Steuben
Warren
Washington
Whitley

IOWA:
Adair
Davis
Howard
Ida
Lyon
Plymouth
Shelby
Sioux
Winneshiek

KANSAS:
Anderson
Barber
Cheyenne

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

KANSAS—Cont.
- Decatur
- Gove
- Graham
- Haskell
- Harper
- Hodgeman
- Jewell
- Kearny
- Kiowa
- Lincoln
- Logan
- Marion
- Nemaha
- Ness
- Norton
- Rawlins
- Rooks
- Scott
- Sheridan
- Smith
- Stafford
- Stanton
- Wallace
- Washington
- Woodson

KENTUCKY:
- Green
- Metcalfe
- Robertson

LOUISIANA:
- Cameron
- Livingston
- Vernon

MINNESOTA:
- Fillmore
- Grant
- Jackson
- Lac qui Parle
- Lincoln
- Marshall
- Norman
- Otter Tail
- Pipestone
- Pope
- Red Lake
- Redwood
- Renville
- Rock
- Roseau
- Sibley
- Stevens
- Todd

MINNESOTA—Cont.
- Traverse
- Yellow Medicine

MISSISSIPPI:
- Itawamba
- Rankin
- Tishomingo

MISSOURI:
- Atchison
- Barton
- Daviess
- De Kalb
- Douglas
- Gasconade
- Gentry
- Grundy
- Knox
- Macon
- Mercer
- Moniteau
- Monroe
- Morgan
- Nodaway
- Oregon
- Osage
- Putnam
- Schuyler
- Scotland
- Shelby
- Stone
- Webster

MONTANA:
- Broadwater
- Carter
- Chouteau
- Daniels
- Fallon
- Fergus
- Gallatin
- Garfield
- Golden Valley
- Judith Basin
- Liberty
- Madison
- McCone
- Meagher
- Petroleum
- Phillips
- Powder River
- Prairie
- Sheridan
- Stillwater
- Sweet Grass

MONTANA—Cont.
- Toole
- Treasure
- Wheatland
- Wibaux

NEBRASKA:
- Antelope
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boone
- Boyd
- Brown
- Burt
- Butler
- Cedar
- Chase
- Cherry
- Cheyenne
- Colfax
- Cuming
- Custer
- Dixon
- Dundy
- Fillmore
- Franklin
- Frontier
- Furnas
- Garden
- Gosper
- Grant
- Greeley
- Hamilton
- Harlan
- Hayes
- Hitchcock
- Holt
- Hooker
- Jefferson
- Johnson
- Kearney
- Keya Paha
- Knox
- Logan
- McPherson
- Morrill
- Nance
- Pawnee
- Perkins
- Pierce
- Platte
- Polk
- Red Willow
- Rock

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Saline
- Saunders
- Sherman
- Sioux
- Stanton
- Thayer
- Thomas
- Valley
- Wayne
- Wheeler

NEVADA:
- Carson City
- Churchill
- Douglas
- Elko
- Eureka
- Humboldt
- Lander
- Lyon
- Nye
- Pershing
- Washoe

NEW MEXICO:
- Catron
- Harding
- Los Alamos

NEW YORK:
- Chenango

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Ashe
- Avery
- Caldwell
- Cherokee
- Clay
- Currituck
- Graham
- Haywood
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Macon
- Martin
- Onslow
- Polk
- Randolph
- Surry
- Watauga
- Wilkes
- Yadkin
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Adams
- Billings
- Bowman
- Burke
- Dickey
- Dunn
- Emmons
- Golden Valley
- Grant
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- La Moure
- Logan
- McHenry
- McIntosh
- Mercer
- Nelson
- Oliver
- Pierce
- Renville
- Sheridan
- Slope
- Stark
- Steele
- Wells

OHIO:
- Holmes

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Cimarron
- Ellis
- Grant
- Harper
- Jefferson
- Kingfisher
- Major
- Payne
- Texas
- Washington
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Sherman
- Wheeler

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Marlboro
- Oconee

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Aurora
- Bon Homme
- Brookings

SOUTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Brule
- Campbell
- Clark
- Custer
- Day
- Deuel
- Douglas
- Edmunds
- Faulk
- Grant
- Haakon
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Hyde
- Jerauld
- Kingsbury
- Marshall
- McCook
- McPherson
- Miner
- Moody
- Perkins
- Potter
- Sanborn
- Spink
- Sully
- Turner
- Union

TENNESSEE:
- Bradley
- Cannon
- Coffee
- Cumberland
- De Kalb
- Decatur
- Fentress
- Greene
- Grundy
- Hawkins
- Jackson
- Lawrence
- Lewis
- Macon
- McMinn
- Moore
- Overton
- Pickett
- Polk
- Putnam

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

TENNESSEE—Cont.
- Sevier
- Van Buren
- Warren
- Wayne
- White

TEXAS:
- Andrews
- Angelina
- Aransas
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Bailey
- Bandera
- Bastrop
- Bell
- Blanco
- Borden
- Bosque
- Brazoria
- Brewster
- Briscoe
- Brown
- Burnet
- Callahan
- Cameron
- Carson
- Castro
- Cherokee
- Childress
- Clay
- Cochran
- Coke
- Collin
- Collingsworth
- Comal
- Comanche
- Concho
- Cooke
- Coryell
- Cottle
- Crane
- Crockett
- Crosby
- Culberson
- Dallam
- Dawson
- Deaf Smith
- Denton
- Dickens
- Donley
- Eastland
- Ector
- Edwards

TEXAS—Cont.
- El Paso
- Erath
- Floyd
- Franklin
- Gaines
- Gillespie
- Glasscock
- Gray
- Guadalupe
- Hale
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardeman
- Hartley
- Hemphill
- Hidalgo
- Hockley
- Hood
- Hudspeth
- Hutchinson
- Jack
- Jeff Davis
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kimble
- King
- Kinney
- Lamb
- Lampasas
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Llano
- Lubbock
- Lynn
- Martin
- Mason
- Maverick
- McCulloch
- Medina
- Menard
- Midland
- Mills
- Mitchell
- Montague
- Moore
- Motley
- Nacogdoches
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Palo Pinto
- Parker

TEXAS—Cont.
- Parmer
- Pecos
- Potter
- Presidio
- Rains
- Randall
- Reagan
- Real
- Reeves
- Roberts
- Rockwell
- Runnels
- San Saba
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Starr
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Swisher
- Taylor
- Terrell
- Throckmorton
- Titus
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Ward
- Webb
- Wheeler
- Wichita
- Wilbarger
- Willacy
- Winkler
- Wise
- Wood
- Yoakum
- Young

UTAH:
- Cache
- Garfield
- Iron
- Kane
- Millard
- Morgan
- Rich
- Summit
- Uintah
- Washington
- Wayne

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*

1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

VIRGINIA:
- Bath
- Bland
- Carroll
- Clifton Forge
- Craig
- Frederick
- Henry
- Highland
- Lunenburg
- Mecklenburg

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Middlesex
- Patrick
- Rockingham
- Scott
- Shenandoah
- Washington

WASHINGTON:
- San Juan

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Monroe

WYOMING:
- Big Horn
- Crook
- Johnson
- Lincoln
- Platte
- Sublette
- Weston

TABLE F-7

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC: 1984

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
- Washington

GEORGIA:
- Fulton

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Pulaski
- St. Clair

MARYLAND:
- Baltimore City

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Suffolk

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Claiborne

MISSOURI:
- Dunklin
- Mississippi
- Pemiscot
- St. Louis City

NEBRASKA:
- Thurston

NEW JERSEY:
- Essex
- Hudson

NEW YORK:
- New York

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette

OHIO:
- Adams
- Pike

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Philadelphia

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale

VIRGINIA:
- Petersburg
- Richmond City

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Lincoln
- McDowell
- Mingo

TABLE F-8

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC: 1984

ALABAMA:
Bibb
Lawrence

ARKANSAS:
Fulton
Marion
Newton
Polk
Scott
Searcy
Sharp
Stone

COLORADO:
Baca

GEORGIA:
Towns
Union

IDAHO:
Owyhee
Washington

KENTUCKY:
Casey
Clinton

MISSISSIPPI:
Attala
Smith

MISSOURI:
Knox

MONTANA:
Carter
Garfield
Judith Basin
Petroleum
Prairie
Treasure

NEBRASKA:
Arthur
Banner
Blaine
Boyd
Greeley
Hayes
Logan
Wheeler

NEVADA:
Eureka

NEW MEXICO:
Union

NORTH CAROLINA:
Cherokee
Chowan
Madison
Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
Billings
Dunn
Emmons
Grant
Hettinger
Kidder
Logan
McIntosh
Sheridan
Slope

OKLAHOMA:
Marshall

SOUTH CAROLINA:
Saluda

SOUTH DAKOTA:
Aurora
Bon Homme
Brule
Campbell
Charles Mix
Clark
Deuel
Douglas
Edmunds
Faulk
Hamlin
Hand
Hanson
Harding
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson
Kingsbury
Lyman
Marshall
McPherson
Miner
Potter
Sanborn
Sully

TENNESSEE:
Bledsoe
Claiborne

TENNESSEE—Cont.
Cumberland
Fentress
Jackson
Overton
Pickett

TEXAS:
Atascosa
Bailey
Briscoe
Castro
Cochran
Collingsworth
Concho
Cottle
Crosby
Dawson
Dickens
Edwards
El Paso
Floyd
Gaines
Glasscock
Hale
Hall
Hardeman
Haskell
Hockley
Hudspeth
Jeff Davis
Kenedy
King
Kinney
Knox
Lamb
Leon
Limestone
Lynn
Mason
Maverick
McCulloch
Medina
Menard
Mills
Mitchell
Motley
Parmer
Presidio
Real
Reeves
Runnels
San Saba
Starr
Swisher

TABLE F-8—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC: 1984

TEXAS—Cont.
- Terry
- Upton
- Uvalde

TEXAS—Cont.
- Val Verde
- Webb
- Wilbarger

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Pendleton

TABLE F-9

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in AFDC: 1979

ALABAMA:
- Macon
- Pickens
- Sumter
- Wilcox

ARKANSAS:
- Phillips

COLORADO:
- Las Animas
- Otero

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:
- Washington

GEORGIA:
- Fulton

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Pulaski
- St. Clair

KENTUCKY:
- Fulton

LOUISIANA:
- East Carroll
- Orleans

MARYLAND:
- Baltimore City

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Suffolk

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Hinds
- Holmes
- Jefferson
- Madison
- Montgomery
- Sharkey
- Tate
- Walthall

MISSOURI:
- Dunklin
- Mississippi
- New Madrid
- Pemiscot
- St. Louis City

NEBRASKA:
- Thurston

NEW JERSEY:
- Essex
- Hudson

NEW YORK:
- New York

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Benson
- Rolette

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Philadelphia

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale
- Bamberg
- Calhoun
- Hampton
- Jasper
- McCormick
- Orangeburg

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Shannon
- Todd

TENNESSEE:
- Shelby

UTAH:
- San Juan

VIRGINIA:
- Franklin
- Norfolk
- Northampton
- Petersburg
- Portsmouth
- Richmond City

WEST VIRGINIA:
- McDowell
- Mingo

TABLE F-10

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in AFDC: 1979

ARIZONA:
- Navajo

ARKANSAS:
- Fulton
- Marion
- Newton
- Searcy

COLORADO:
- Baca

FLORIDA:
- Hardee
- Suwannee

GEORGIA:
- Towns
- Union

IDAHO:
- Owyhee

IOWA:
- Davis

KENTUCKY:
- Green
- Metcalfe
- Robertson

MINNESOTA:
- Lincoln

MISSOURI:
- Douglas
- Knox
- Oregon
- Stone

MONTANA:
- Carter
- Garfield
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boyd
- Greeley
- Hayes
- Logan
- Morrill
- Wheeler

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Cherokee
- Hyde
- Martin
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Billings
- Dunn
- Emmons
- Grant
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Sheridan
- Slope

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Marlboro

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Aurora
- Bon Homme
- Brule
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Douglas
- Edmunds
- Faulk
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Hyde
- Kingsbury
- Marshall
- McPherson
- Miner
- Potter
- Sanborn
- Sully

TENNESSEE:
- Cumberland
- Fentress
- Grundy
- Jackson
- Overton
- Pickett

TEXAS:
- Bailey
- Briscoe
- Cameron
- Castro
- Cochran
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- Cottle
- Crosby
- Dawson
- Dickens
- Edwards
- El Paso
- Floyd
- Gaines
- Glasscock
- Hale
- Hall
- Hardeman
- Hidalgo
- Hockley
- Hudspeth
- Jeff Davis
- Kenedy
- King
- Kinney
- Lamb
- Lynn
- Mason
- Maverick
- McCulloch
- Medina
- Menard
- Mills
- Mitchell
- Motley
- Parmer
- Presidio
- Real
- Reeves
- Runnels
- San Saba
- Starr
- Swisher
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Webb
- Wilbarger
- Willacy

APPENDIX G

Tables Relating to Participation in Head Start

Page
Table G-1—Head Start High Participation Counties 271
Table G-2—Head Start Low Participation Counties 276
Table G-3—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In Head Start 282
Table G-4—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In Head Start 284

TABLE G-1

Head Start High Participation Counties

ALABAMA:
- Chambers
- Colbert
- Cullman
- Greene
- Jackson
- Lee
- Lowndes
- Macon
- Montgomery
- Pickens
- Sumter
- Tallapoosa

ARIZONA:
- Apache
- Coconino
- Gila
- Navajo
- Pinal
- Santa Cruz

ARKANSAS:
- Baxter
- Carroll
- Clark
- Clay
- Cleveland
- Conway
- Fulton
- Hot Spring
- Izard
- Johnson
- Lawrence
- Little River
- Madison
- Perry
- Pope
- Randolph
- Saline
- Scott
- Searcy
- Yell

CALIFORNIA:
- Alpine
- Imperial
- Lake
- Madera
- Mono
- Napa
- San Luis Obispo

COLORADO:
- Alamosa
- Archuleta
- Bent

COLORADO—Cont.
- Conejos
- Costilla
- Crowley
- Fremont
- Huerfano
- Jefferson
- La Plata
- Las Animas
- Montezuma
- Otero
- Rio Grande
- Saguache

FLORIDA:
- Charlotte
- De Soto
- Indian River
- Manatee
- Okeechobee
- Taylor

GEORGIA:
- Banks
- Butts
- Chattooga
- Clinch
- Colquitt
- Dade
- Dawson
- Fannin
- Franklin
- Gilmer
- Habersham
- Hall
- Hart
- Jackson
- Jasper
- Jeff Davis
- Lumpkin
- Morgan
- Oglethorpe
- Pickens
- Pulaski
- Putnam
- Rabun
- Rockdale
- Schley
- Stephens
- Stewart
- Towns
- Walker
- Washington
- Webster
- White

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Whitfield
- Worth

IDAHO:
- Canyon
- Clearwater
- Nez Perce
- Washington

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Cass
- Coles
- Edwards
- Hamilton
- Massac
- Monroe
- Moultrie
- Perry
- Pulaski
- Richland
- Wabash

INDIANA:
- Dearborn
- Floyd
- Fountain
- Jefferson
- Knox
- Ohio
- Ripley
- St. Joseph
- Sullivan
- Switzerland

IOWA:
- Boone
- Clay
- Decatur
- Harrison
- Lucas
- Monona
- Pocahontas

KANSAS:
- Allen
- Brown
- Cherokee
- Crawford
- Doniphan
- Grant
- Jackson
- Labette
- Neosho
- Shawnee

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*

Head Start High Participation Counties

KENTUCKY:
- Ballard
- Bath
- Boyd
- Bracken
- Breckinridge
- Calloway
- Carlisle
- Carroll
- Cumberland
- Elliott
- Fleming
- Grant
- Hickman
- Jackson
- Johnson
- Knott
- Knox
- Lee
- Lyon
- Magoffin
- Martin
- Mason
- McCracken
- Menifee
- Morgan
- Nicholas
- Oldham
- Owsley
- Pike
- Powell
- Robertson
- Taylor
- Trigg
- Trimble
- Washington
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- Acadia
- Catahoula
- Iberville
- La Salle
- Lafayette
- Rapides
- St. Helena
- St. James
- St. Landry
- St. Martin
- Vermilion

MAINE:
- Franklin
- Piscataquis

MARYLAND:
- Calvert
- Charles
- Howard
- Kent
- Montgomery
- Queen Anne's
- Somerset
- Talbot
- Worcester

MICHIGAN:
- Alger
- Alpena
- Baraga
- Benzie
- Chippewa
- Crawford
- Dickinson
- Gladwin
- Gogebic
- Houghton
- Huron
- Iron
- Jackson
- Keweenaw
- Lake
- Leelanau
- Luce
- Mackinac
- Menominee
- Montmorency
- Newaygo
- Ontonagon
- Osceola
- Oscoda
- Presque Isle
- Roscommon
- Schoolcraft

MINNESOTA:
- Beltrami
- Big Stone
- Cass
- Cook
- Grant
- Itasca
- Koochiching
- Lac qui Parle
- Lake
- Lake Of The Woods
- Mille Lacs
- Polk
- Roseau
- St. Louis
- Traverse

MINNESOTA—Cont.
- Wright
- Yellow Medicine

MISSISSIPPI:
- Adams
- Alcorn
- Amite
- Attala
- Benton
- Bolivar
- Calhoun
- Carroll
- Chickasaw
- Choctaw
- Claiborne
- Clarke
- Clay
- Coahoma
- Copiah
- De Soto
- Forrest
- Franklin
- George
- Greene
- Grenada
- Hancock
- Harrison
- Holmes
- Humphreys
- Issaquena
- Itawamba
- Jackson
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Jefferson Davis
- Jones
- Kemper
- Lafayette
- Lauderdale
- Lawrence
- Leake
- Lee
- Leflore
- Lincoln
- Lowndes
- Madison
- Marion
- Marshall
- Montgomery
- Neshoba
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Pearl River
- Perry

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*

Head Start High Participation Counties

MISSISSIPPI—Cont.
- Pike
- Pontotoc
- Prentiss
- Quitman
- Rankin
- Scott
- Sharkey
- Smith
- Stone
- Sunflower
- Tate
- Tippah
- Tishomingo
- Tunica
- Walthall
- Warren
- Washington
- Wayne
- Webster
- Wilkinson
- Winston
- Yalobusha
- Yazoo

MISSOURI:
- Barry
- Bollinger
- Caldwell
- Carter
- Chariton
- Clark
- Dade
- Douglas
- Dunklin
- Gentry
- Holt
- Howard
- Lewis
- Madison
- Mississippi
- Osage
- Phelps
- Reynolds
- Saline
- Schuyler
- Scott
- Shannon
- Stoddard
- Sullivan
- Washington
- Worth
- Wright

MONTANA:
- Blaine
- Deer Lodge
- Glacier
- Hill
- Lewis And Clark
- Missoula
- Pondera
- Roosevelt
- Rosebud
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Box Butte
- Cass
- Dakota
- Dawes
- Fillmore
- Greeley
- Hall
- Nemaha
- Richardson
- Sheridan
- Thurston

NEVADA:
- Douglas
- Elko
- Humboldt
- Mineral
- White Pine

NEW MEXICO:
- Catron
- Eddy
- Grant
- Guadalupe
- McKinley
- Mora
- Quay
- Rio Arriba
- San Juan
- San Miguel
- Sandoval
- Santa Fe
- Socorro
- Taos
- Union
- Valencia

NEW YORK:
- Lewis
- Montgomery
- Schoharie
- Tioga

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Chatham
- Dare
- Franklin
- Haywood
- Henderson
- Jackson
- Jones
- Macon
- Madison
- Martin
- Pamlico
- Rowan
- Scotland
- Swain
- Vance
- Wayne
- Yadkin

NORTH DAKOTA:
- McHenry
- Rolette
- Sioux
- Williams

OHIO:
- Delaware
- Gallia
- Guernsey
- Highland
- Jackson
- Lucas
- Mercer
- Monroe
- Morrow
- Noble
- Ottawa
- Pike
- Preble
- Putnam
- Scioto
- Warren
- Washington
- Wyandot

OKLAHOMA:
- Adair
- Atoka
- Beckham
- Blaine
- Bryan
- Caddo
- Cherokee
- Choctaw
- Cotton
- Delaware

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*

Head Start High Participation Counties

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
- Harmon
- Haskell
- Hughes
- Jefferson
- Johnston
- Kiowa
- Latimer
- Le Flore
- Logan
- Love
- Marshall
- McClain
- McCurtain
- McIntosh
- Murray
- Noble
- Nowata
- Okfuskee
- Osage
- Payne
- Pittsburg
- Pontotoc
- Pottawatomie
- Seminole
- Sequoyah
- Tillman
- Washita

OREGON:
- Hood River
- Jefferson

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Cameron
- Forest
- Franklin
- Montour
- Perry
- Union

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Abbeville
- Anderson
- Cherokee
- Chester
- Clarendon
- Fairfield
- Laurens
- McCormick
- Newberry
- Union

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Aurora
- Buffalo

SOUTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Clay
- Corson
- Dewey
- Hughes
- Jerauld
- Lyman
- Shannon
- Todd
- Walworth
- Ziebach

TENNESSEE:
- Bedford
- Benton
- Cannon
- Chester
- Clay
- Cumberland
- De Kalb
- Giles
- Hancock
- Jackson
- Macon
- Meigs
- Moore
- Morgan
- Perry
- Polk
- Sequatchie
- Smith
- Trousdale
- Unicoi
- Weakley
- White

TEXAS:
- Bailey
- Bastrop
- Bee
- Blanco
- Brown
- Burnet
- Cherokee
- Childress
- Clay
- Cottle
- Crosby
- Dimmit
- Fannin
- Floyd
- Gillespie
- Goliad
- Gray
- Howard

TEXAS—Cont.
- Jim Hogg
- Karnes
- Kinney
- Llano
- Lynn
- Madison
- Mason
- Matagorda
- Maverick
- Mills
- Navarro
- Palo Pinto
- Potter
- Sabine
- Starr
- Tom Green
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Willacy
- Wilson
- Zapata
- Zavala

UTAH:
- Carbon
- Emery
- San Juan
- Uintah

VERMONT:
- Addison
- Caledonia
- Essex

VIRGINIA:
- Bedford
- Botetourt
- Craig
- Fauquier
- Floyd
- Fredericksburg
- Galax
- Giles
- Grayson
- Lee
- Montgomery
- Norton
- Orange
- Rockbridge
- Russell
- Scott
- Smyth
- Wise

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*

Head Start High Participation Counties

WASHINGTON:
- Asotin
- Clallam
- Ferry
- Pend Oreille

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Clay
- Hardy
- McDowell
- Mingo
- Pendleton
- Taylor
- Wirt

WISCONSIN:
- Ashland
- Bayfield
- Douglas
- Florence
- Forest
- Iron
- Jackson
- Manitowoc
- Menominee
- Price
- Racine
- Sauk
- Sawyer
- Vilas

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Washburn
- Waushara
- Wood

WYOMING:
- Converse
- Fremont
- Goshen
- Hot Springs
- Laramie
- Niobrara
- Platte
- Washakie

TABLE G-2

Head Start Low Participation Counties

ALABAMA:
- Autauga
- Bibb
- Blount
- Chilton
- Choctaw
- Clarke
- Conecuh
- Dale*
- Fayette
- Franklin
- Geneva
- Hale
- Lamar
- Limestone
- Marengo
- Marion
- Randolph*
- Shelby
- Washington*
- Wilcox
- Winston

ARKANSAS:
- Arkansas
- Calhoun
- Dallas
- Grant
- Howard
- Lincoln
- Lonoke
- Montgomery*
- Pike*
- Prairie
- Sevier
- Union

CALIFORNIA:
- Amador*
- Calaveras*
- Mariposa
- San Benito*
- Sierra*
- Trinity
- Tuolumne*

COLORADO:
- Baca
- Chaffee
- Cheyenne
- Clear Creek
- Custer
- Delta*
- Dolores
- Douglas
- Eagle

COLORADO—Cont.
- Elbert
- Garfield
- Gilpin
- Grand
- Gunnison
- Hinsdale
- Jackson
- Kiowa
- Kit Carson
- Lake
- Lincoln
- Logan
- Moffat
- Montrose*
- Ouray
- Park
- Phillips
- Pitkin
- Prowers
- Rio Blanco
- Routt
- San Juan
- San Miguel
- Sedgwick
- Summit
- Teller
- Washington
- Yuma

FLORIDA:
- Calhoun
- Citrus
- Dixie
- Franklin
- Gadsden
- Gilchrist
- Gulf
- Highlands
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Levy
- Liberty
- Madison
- Monroe
- Nassau
- Osceola
- Santa Rosa
- Sumter*
- Wakulla

GEORGIA:
- Atkinson
- Baker*
- Barrow*
- Berrien*

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Bleckley*
- Brantley
- Brooks
- Calhoun
- Candler*
- Charlton
- Clay
- Columbia
- Cook*
- Crawford
- Crisp*
- Decatur
- Dooly
- Echols*
- Effingham*
- Fayette
- Glascock
- Hancock*
- Heard
- Johnson
- Jones
- Lamar*
- Lee
- Lincoln
- Madison*
- McIntosh
- Miller
- Mitchell*
- Monroe
- Montgomery*
- Murray*
- Oconee
- Pierce
- Pike
- Quitman
- Randolph*
- Richmond*
- Seminole
- Talbot
- Taliaferro
- Taylor
- Treutlen*
- Turner*
- Twiggs*
- Warren
- Wilkes
- Wilkinson

IDAHO:
- Adams
- Bear Lake
- Blaine
- Boise
- Boundary

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—*Cont.*

Head Start Low Participation Counties

IDAHO—Cont.
- Butte
- Camas
- Caribou
- Clark
- Custer
- Elmore
- Franklin
- Fremont
- Jefferson
- Lemhi
- Lincoln
- Madison
- Oneida
- Owyhee
- Teton
- Valley

ILLINOIS:
- Boone
- Bureau*
- Carroll
- Crawford
- De Witt
- Douglas
- Ford
- Gallatin*
- Grundy
- Hardin*
- Henderson*
- Jasper
- Kendall
- Marshall
- McDonough*
- Menard
- Pope*
- Putnam
- Scott*
- Stark*
- Woodford*

INDIANA:
- Benton
- Boone
- Carroll
- Cass
- Clinton
- Decatur*
- Elkhart
- Fayette
- Franklin
- Fulton
- Gibson
- Hamilton
- Hendricks
- Howard

INDIANA—Cont.
- Huntington*
- Jasper
- Jennings*
- Johnson*
- Kosciusko
- Lagrange
- Marshall*
- Martin
- Miami
- Montgomery*
- Morgan*
- Newton*
- Noble
- Porter
- Posey
- Pulaski
- Rush*
- Scott*
- Shelby*
- Starke*
- Tipton
- Union
- Wabash
- White
- Whitley

IOWA:
- Butler
- Cass*
- Cedar*
- Fremont
- Grundy
- Hardin*
- Mills
- Mitchell
- Montgomery
- Page
- Taylor
- Worth

KANSAS:
- Anderson
- Barber
- Barton
- Chase
- Chautauqua
- Cheyenne
- Clark
- Clay
- Cloud
- Coffey
- Comanche
- Cowley
- Decatur*
- Dickinson

KANSAS—Cont.
- Edwards
- Elk
- Ellis
- Ellsworth
- Gove*
- Graham*
- Gray
- Greeley
- Greenwood
- Hamilton
- Harper
- Haskell
- Hodgeman
- Jefferson
- Jewell
- Kearny
- Kingman
- Kiowa
- Lane
- Leavenworth
- Lincoln
- Logan*
- Marion
- Marshall
- McPherson
- Meade
- Mitchell
- Morris
- Morton
- Ness
- Norton
- Osborne
- Ottawa
- Pawnee
- Phillips
- Pottawatomie
- Pratt
- Rawlins*
- Republic
- Rice
- Rooks
- Rush
- Russell
- Saline
- Seward*
- Sheridan*
- Smith
- Stafford
- Stanton
- Stevens
- Sumner
- Thomas*
- Trego*
- Wabaunsee

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—*Cont.*

Head Start Low Participation Counties

KANSAS—Cont.
- Wallace*
- Washington
- Wilson
- Woodson

KENTUCKY:
- Bullitt
- Caldwell
- Crittenden
- Gallatin
- Garrard*
- Harrison*
- Henry
- Livingston
- Meade
- Metcalfe
- Owen
- Pendleton
- Rockcastle*
- Scott
- Shelby
- Spencer
- Todd

LOUISIANA:
- Assumption
- Bienville*
- Caldwell
- Cameron
- Claiborne
- Concordia
- East Feliciana
- Franklin
- Grant
- Jackson*
- Lafourche
- Livingston
- Madison
- Plaquemines
- Red River*
- Richland
- Sabine
- St. Bernard
- Tensas
- Terrebonne
- Union
- West Baton Rouge
- West Carroll
- West Feliciana
- Winn*

MARYLAND:
- Caroline

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Dukes

MINNESOTA:
- Dakota*
- Freeborn
- Mower*
- Olmsted*
- Washington*

MISSOURI:
- Barton
- Montgomery
- Warren

MONTANA:
- Beaverhead
- Big Horn*
- Broadwater
- Carbon
- Carter
- Chouteau
- Custer
- Daniels
- Dawson
- Fallon
- Fergus
- Gallatin
- Garfield
- Golden Valley
- Granite*
- Jefferson
- Judith Basin
- Liberty
- Lincoln
- Madison
- McCone
- Meagher
- Musselshell
- Park
- Petroleum
- Phillips
- Powder River
- Powell
- Prairie
- Richland
- Sanders
- Sheridan
- Stillwater
- Sweet Grass
- Teton
- Toole
- Treasure
- Wheatland
- Wibaux

NEBRASKA:
- Antelope*
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boone*
- Boyd
- Brown*
- Butler
- Chase
- Cherry*
- Clay
- Colfax
- Cuming
- Dawson
- Deuel
- Dixon
- Dundy
- Franklin
- Frontier
- Furnas
- Garden*
- Garfield
- Gosper
- Grant
- Hamilton*
- Harlan
- Hayes
- Hitchcock
- Holt
- Hooker
- Johnson
- Kearney
- Keith
- Keya Paha
- Lincoln
- Logan
- Loup
- Madison*
- McPherson
- Nance
- Nuckolls
- Otoe*
- Pawnee
- Perkins
- Phelps
- Pierce
- Platte*
- Polk
- Red Willow
- Rock
- Sarpy
- Saunders
- Seward
- Stanton
- Thomas

---

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—*Cont.*

Head Start Low Participation Counties

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Washington
- Wayne
- York

NEVADA:
- Carson City
- Esmeralda
- Eureka
- Lander
- Lincoln
- Nye
- Pershing

NEW MEXICO:
- De Baca
- Harding
- Hidalgo*
- Lea*
- Lincoln
- Los Alamos
- Luna
- Sierra*
- Torrance

NEW YORK:
- Allegany*
- Genesee
- Hamilton*
- Herkimer*
- Livingston
- Putnam
- Seneca
- Wyoming
- Yates

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Alexander*
- Alleghany
- Ashe*
- Bertie
- Camden
- Caswell
- Currituck
- Davidson
- Halifax
- Hertford
- Lincoln
- Northampton
- Person
- Pitt
- Polk
- Randolph
- Rutherford
- Stanly*
- Transylvania

NORTH CAROLINA—Cont.
- Tyrrell
- Wilkes*
- Wilson*

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Adams
- Barnes
- Billings
- Bowman
- Burke
- Cavalier
- Dickey
- Divide
- Eddy
- Emmons
- Foster
- Golden Valley
- Griggs
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- La Moure
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Nelson
- Oliver
- Pembina
- Ramsey*
- Ransom
- Renville
- Richland*
- Sargent
- Sheridan
- Slope
- Stark
- Steele
- Stutsman*
- Towner
- Traill
- Walsh
- Wells

OHIO:
- Medina*
- Union*

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Cimarron
- Dewey
- Ellis
- Garfield
- Garvin
- Grant

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
- Harper
- Kay*
- Major
- Roger Mills*
- Texas
- Woods
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Benton*
- Crook
- Curry
- Deschutes*
- Gilliam
- Grant
- Harney
- Lake
- Lincoln*
- Morrow
- Sherman
- Tillamook*
- Wallowa
- Wasco
- Wheeler

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Northumberland*
- Pike
- Wayne*
- Wyoming

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Bon Homme*
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Grant*
- Haakon
- Hamlin
- Hanson*
- Harding
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Jones
- Lincoln*
- McCook
- Moody*
- Perkins
- Potter
- Stanley*
- Sully*

TENNESSEE:
- Cheatham
- Crockett*

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2--*Cont.*

Head Start Low Participation Counties

TENNESSEE—Cont.
- Dickson
- Hardeman*
- Hickman*
- Lewis*
- Madison
- Marshall*
- Montgomery*
- Robertson
- Sumner*
- Van Buren

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Andrews
- Aransas
- Archer
- Armstrong
- Austin
- Bandera
- Baylor
- Borden
- Brewster
- Briscoe
- Calhoun
- Callahan
- Camp
- Carson
- Castro
- Chambers
- Coke
- Collingsworth
- Colorado
- Comanche*
- Concho
- Coryell
- Crane
- Crockett
- Culberson
- De Witt
- Delta
- Donley
- Duval*
- Eastland*
- Edwards
- Ellis
- Erath
- Falls*
- Fayette
- Fisher
- Foard
- Franklin
- Freestone
- Gaines
- Glasscock

TEXAS—Cont.
- Grayson
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardin
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hemphill
- Henderson
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Houston
- Hudspeth
- Hunt
- Irion
- Jack
- Jackson
- Jasper*
- Jeff Davis
- Johnson
- Jones
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kerr
- Kimble
- King
- Knox
- Lamar
- Lamb
- Lavaca
- Lee
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- McMullen
- Menard
- Milam
- Mitchell
- Montgomery
- Moore*
- Morris
- Motley
- Newton*
- Nolan
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parker
- Parmer
- Pecos
- Presidio
- Rains
- Randall
- Reagan
- Refugio
- Roberts

TEXAS—Cont.
- Rockwall
- San Jacinto
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Sherman
- Somervell
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Terrell
- Throckmorton
- Titus
- Trinity
- Tyler
- Upshur
- Van Zandt
- Walker
- Waller
- Ward
- Wheeler
- Winkler
- Wise
- Wood
- Yoakum
- Young

UTAH:
- Beaver
- Daggett
- Garfield*
- Iron*
- Juab
- Kane
- Millard*
- Morgan
- Piute
- Rich
- Sanpete
- Sevier*
- Summit
- Tooele
- Washington*
- Wayne

VERMONT:
- Grand Isle

VIRGINIA:
- Accomack*
- Amelia
- Amherst
- Appomattox
- Augusta

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—*Cont.*

Head Start Low Participation Counties

VIRGINIA—Cont.

- Bath
- Bedford*
- Brunswick
- Buchanan
- Buena Vista
- Campbell
- Caroline
- Charlotte
- Clarke
- Clifton Forge
- Colonial Heights
- Covington
- Culpeper
- Cumberland*
- Dickenson
- Dinwiddie
- Emporia
- Essex
- Fairfax
- Falls Church
- Fluvanna*
- Franklin*
- Frederick
- Gloucester
- Greene
- Greensville
- Halifax
- Hampton*
- Hanover
- Harrisonburg
- Henry
- Highland
- Hopewell
- King And Queen
- King George
- King William
- Lancaster
- Lexington

VIRGINIA—Cont.

- Lunenburg
- Madison
- Manassas
- Manassas Park
- Martinsville
- Mathews
- Mecklenburg
- Middlesex
- Nelson
- Northampton*
- Northumberland
- Nottoway
- Page
- Patrick
- Petersburg
- Poquoson
- Powhatan
- Prince George
- Prince William
- Radford*
- Rappahannock
- Richmond
- Rockingham*
- Shenandoah
- South Boston
- Spotsylvania
- Staunton
- Surry
- Sussex
- Tazewell*
- Warren
- Waynesboro
- Westmoreland
- Winchester

WASHINGTON:

- Adams
- Columbia
- Garfield

WASHINGTON—Cont.

- Lewis
- Lincoln
- Pacific
- San Juan
- Skamania
- Wahkiakum
- Whitman

WEST VIRGINIA:

- Greenbrier*
- Jefferson
- Lewis
- Pocahontas
- Summers
- Webster

WISCONSIN:

- Calumet
- Clark
- Door
- Green
- Green Lake*
- Kewaunee
- Langlade*
- Oneida*
- Ozaukee

WYOMING:

- Campbell
- Crook
- Johnson
- Lincoln
- Sheridan
- Sublette
- Sweetwater
- Teton
- Uinta
- Weston

*Counties in which a new Head Start program was instituted in fiscal year 1985.

TABLE G-3

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in Head Start

ALABAMA:
- Greene
- Lowndes
- Macon
- Montgomery
- Pickens
- Sumter

ARIZONA:
- Apache
- Navajo

ARKANSAS:
- Fulton
- Scott
- Searcy

COLORADO:
- Conejos
- Costilla
- Huerfano
- Las Animas
- Otero
- Saguache

FLORIDA:
- De Soto
- Taylor

GEORGIA:
- Clinch
- Morgan
- Pulaski
- Schley
- Stewart
- Towns
- Washington
- Webster
- Worth

IDAHO:
- Washington

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander
- Pulaski

KENTUCKY:
- Bath
- Breckinridge
- Cumberland
- Elliott
- Fleming
- Jackson
- Johnson
- Knott
- Knox

KENTUCKY—Cont.
- Lee
- Magoffin
- Martin
- Menifee
- Morgan
- Owsley
- Powell
- Robertson
- Washington
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- Acadia
- Catahoula
- Iberville
- St. Helena
- St. Landry

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Adams
- Amite
- Attala
- Benton
- Bolivar
- Calhoun
- Carroll
- Choctaw
- Claiborne
- Clay
- Coahoma
- Copiah
- Forrest
- Franklin
- Greene
- Grenada
- Holmes
- Humphreys
- Issaquena
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Jefferson Davis
- Kemper
- Lauderdale
- Leake
- Leflore
- Lincoln
- Lowndes
- Madison
- Marion
- Marshall
- Montgomery
- Neshoba

MISSISSIPPI—Cont.
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Pearl River
- Perry
- Pike
- Quitman
- Scott
- Sharkey
- Smith
- Sunflower
- Tate
- Tunica
- Walthall
- Washington
- Wayne
- Wilkinson
- Winston
- Yalobusha
- Yazoo

MISSOURI:
- Carter
- Douglas
- Dunklin
- Mississippi
- Reynolds
- Shannon
- Worth
- Wright

MONTANA:
- Blaine
- Glacier

NEBRASKA:
- Greeley
- Thurston

NEW MEXICO:
- Guadalupe
- McKinley
- Mora
- Rio Arriba
- San Miguel
- Socorro
- Taos
- Union

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Madison
- Martin
- Swain
- Vance

TABLE G-3—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in Head Start

- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Rolette
  - Sioux
- OHIO:
  - Pike
- OKLAHOMA:
  - Adair
  - Atoka
  - Caddo
  - Choctaw
  - Delaware
  - Harmon
  - Hughes
  - Johnston
  - Kiowa
  - Latimer
  - Marshall
  - McCurtain
  - McIntosh
  - Tillman
- SOUTH CAROLINA:
  - Clarendon
  - Fairfield
  - McCormick
- SOUTH DAKOTA:
  - Aurora
  - Buffalo
  - Corson
  - Dewey
  - Lyman
  - Shannon
  - Todd
  - Ziebach
- TENNESSEE:
  - Clay
  - Cumberland
  - Hancock
  - Jackson
  - Morgan
- TEXAS:
  - Bailey
  - Bee
  - Cottle
  - Crosby
  - Dimmit
  - Floyd
  - Karnes
  - Kinney
  - Lynn
- TEXAS—Cont.
  - Madison
  - Mason
  - Maverick
  - Mills
  - Starr
  - Upton
  - Uvalde
  - Val Verde
  - Willacy
  - Zapata
  - Zavala
- UTAH:
  - San Juan
- VIRGINIA:
  - Lee
- WEST VIRGINIA:
  - Clay
  - McDowell
  - Mingo
  - Pendleton

TABLE G-4

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in Head Start

ALABAMA:
- Bibb
- Choctaw
- Clarke
- Conecuh
- Hale
- Marengo
- Randolph
- Washington
- Wilcox

ARKANSAS:
- Arkansas
- Calhoun
- Lincoln
- Prairie

COLORADO:
- Baca
- Dolores

FLORIDA:
- Calhoun
- Dixie
- Franklin
- Gadsden
- Gulf
- Highlands
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Levy
- Liberty
- Madison
- Sumter

GEORGIA:
- Atkinson
- Baker
- Brooks
- Calhoun
- Candler
- Charlton
- Clay
- Crisp
- Decatur
- Dooly
- Echols
- Hancock
- Johnson
- Lincoln
- McIntosh
- Miller
- Mitchell
- Montgomery
- Pierce
- Quitman
- Randolph

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Seminole
- Talbot
- Taliaferro
- Taylor
- Treutlen
- Turner
- Warren

IDAHO:
- Owyhee

KENTUCKY:
- Metcalfe
- Owen
- Rockcastle

LOUISIANA:
- Bienville
- Caldwell
- Claiborne
- Concordia
- East Feliciana
- Franklin
- Madison
- Red River
- Richland
- Sabine
- Tensas
- West Carroll
- West Feliciana
- Winn

MONTANA:
- Carter
- Garfield
- Judith Basin
- Petroleum
- Prairie
- Treasure

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boyd
- Hayes
- Logan

NEVADA:
- Eureka

NEW MEXICO:
- De Baca
- Luna
- Sierra
- Torrance

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Bertie
- Halifax
- Hertford
- Northampton
- Pitt
- Tyrrell
- Wilson

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Billings
- Emmons
- Hettinger
- Kidder
- Logan
- McIntosh
- Sheridan
- Slope

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Bon Homme
- Campbell
- Clark
- Deuel
- Hamlin
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hyde
- Jackson
- Potter
- Sully

TENNESSEE:
- Hardeman

TEXAS:
- Briscoe
- Castro
- Collingsworth
- Concho
- De Witt
- Duval
- Edwards
- Falls
- Gaines
- Glasscock
- Haskell
- Houston
- Hudspeth
- Jeff Davis
- Kenedy
- King
- Knox
- Lamb
- Menard
- Mitchell
- Motley

TABLE G-4—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in Head Start

TEXAS—Cont.
- Parmer
- Presidio
- San Jacinto

VIRGINIA:
- Accomack
- Brunswick

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Charlotte
- Cumberland
- Franklin
- Greensville
- Northampton
- Petersburg

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Surry
- Sussex
- Westmoreland

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Summers
- Webster

APPENDIX H

Tables Relating to Participation in WIC

Page

Table H-1—WIC High Participation Counties 289

Table H-2—WIC Low Participation Counties 294

Table H-3—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In WIC . 299

Table H-4—Child Poverty Counties Low High Participation In WIC ... 300

TABLE H-1

WIC High Participation Counties

ALABAMA:
- Cherokee
- Coffee
- Colbert
- Covington
- Escambia
- Franklin
- Henry
- Lauderdale
- Marion
- Winston

CALIFORNIA:
- Alpine
- Amador
- Del Norte
- San Benito
- Santa Cruz
- Sierra
- Trinity

COLORADO:
- Bent
- Chaffee
- Crowley
- Fremont
- Lake
- Larimer
- Morgan
- Otero
- Park
- Prowers
- Pueblo
- Routt
- Saguache
- Sedgwick

CONNECTICUT:
- Toiland
- Windham

FLORIDA:
- Collier
- Gilchrist
- Martin
- Nassau
- Okeechobee
- Pasco

GEORGIA:
- Atkinson
- Bacon
- Baker
- Banks
- Barrow
- Brantley
- Bryan

GEORGIA—Cont.
- Butts
- Calhoun
- Charlton
- Cherokee
- Clay
- Cook
- Crawford
- Dawson
- Evans
- Floyd
- Forsyth
- Hall
- Hancock
- Haralson
- Harris
- Irwin
- Jackson
- Jeff Davis
- Lee
- Madison
- Miller
- Morgan
- Pickens
- Polk
- Quitman
- Randolph
- Schley
- Stephens
- Stewart
- Talbot
- Taliaferro
- Twiggs
- Wayne
- White
- Whitfield
- Wilkinson

IDAHO:
- Clark
- Lewis
- Valley

ILLINOIS:
- Adams
- Alexander
- Bond
- Bureau
- Cass
- Effingham
- Fulton
- Grundy
- Hardin
- Henderson
- Jasper
- Jersey

ILLINOIS—Cont.
- Jo Daviess
- Johnson
- Lee
- Logan
- Massac
- Menard
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pike
- Pope
- Putnam
- Randolph
- Stephenson
- Union
- Wabash

INDIANA:
- Blackford
- Boone
- Brown
- Clay
- Dubois
- Franklin
- Hendricks
- Jay
- Jennings
- Ohio
- Owen
- Pike
- Porter
- Putnam
- Randolph
- Scott
- Warrick
- Wells

IOWA:
- Buena Vista
- Carroll
- Clinton
- Dallas
- Decatur
- Des Moines
- Fayette
- Linn
- Monona
- Montgomery
- Page
- Story
- Union
- Wapello

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*

WIC High Participation Counties

- KANSAS:
  - Allen
  - Chase
  - Chautauqua
  - Cherokee
  - Crawford
  - Finney
  - Neosho
  - Osage
  - Saline
  - Shawnee
  - Sherman
  - Stevens
  - Thomas
  - Wabaunsee
- KENTUCKY:
  - Anderson
  - Ballard
  - Butler
  - Caldwell
  - Calloway
  - Estill
  - Fleming
  - Gallatin
  - Grant
  - Lee
  - Livingston
  - Marshall
  - Martin
  - McCracken
  - McLean
  - Perry
  - Robertson
  - Rowan
  - Trigg
  - Union
  - Wolfe
- LOUISIANA:
  - Allen
  - Bossier
  - Caldwell
  - East Carroll
  - Evangeline
  - Red River
  - St. Bernard
  - St. Helena
  - St. James
  - Washington
  - Webster
- MARYLAND:
  - Allegany
  - Calvert
  - Carroll
- MARYLAND—Cont.
  - Charles
  - Garrett
  - Howard
  - Kent
  - Montgomery
  - Washington
- MICHIGAN:
  - Alger
  - Alpena
  - Antrim
  - Bay
  - Benzie
  - Charlevoix
  - Cheboygan
  - Chippewa
  - Crawford
  - Delta
  - Dickinson
  - Emmet
  - Gogebic
  - Grand Traverse
  - Houghton
  - Huron
  - Iron
  - Kalamazoo
  - Keweenaw
  - Lake
  - Lapeer
  - Luce
  - Mackinac
  - Manistee
  - Marquette
  - Mason
  - Menominee
  - Oceana
  - Ontonagon
  - Osceola
  - Oscoda
  - Otsego
  - Roscommon
  - Sanilac
  - Schoolcraft
  - Shiawassee
  - St. Clair
  - Tuscola
  - Washtenaw
- MINNESOTA:
  - Aitkin
  - Anoka
  - Becker
  - Big Stone
  - Cass
  - Clay
- MINNESOTA—Cont.
  - Cook
  - Crow Wing
  - Goodhue
  - Grant
  - Itasca
  - Kandiyohi
  - Koochiching
  - Lake
  - Mille Lacs
  - Olmsted
  - Polk
  - Ramsey
  - Rice
  - Scott
  - St. Louis
  - Wilkin
  - Wright
- MISSISSIPPI:
  - Benton
  - Chickasaw
  - Claiborne
  - Clay
  - Franklin
  - Greene
  - Grenada
  - Itawamba
  - Jasper
  - Jefferson
  - Lafayette
  - Lawrence
  - Leake
  - Lee
  - Montgomery
  - Newton
  - Noxubee
  - Perry
  - Prentiss
  - Tallahatchie
  - Tishomingo
  - Warren
  - Webster
  - Winston
  - Yalobusha
- MISSOURI:
  - Audrain
  - Bollinger
  - Boone
  - Carroll
  - Carter
  - Christian
  - Dade
  - Gasconade
  - Henry

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*

WIC High Participation Counties

MISSOURI—Cont.
- Holt
- Howard
- Lafayette
- Lewis
- Linn
- Macon
- Madison
- Moniteau
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pettis
- Phelps
- Ralls
- Ray
- Reynolds
- St. Francois
- Stoddard
- Stone
- Warren
- Washington
- Wayne
- Wright

MONTANA:
- Jefferson
- Sanders
- Silver Bow

NEBRASKA:
- Adams
- Dakota
- Dawes
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Keith
- Keya Paha
- Lincoln

NEVADA:
- Carson City
- Douglas
- Esmeralda
- Humboldt
- Lincoln
- Lyon
- Pershing
- Storey
- Washoe

NEW HAMPSHIRE:
- Carroll
- Coos
- Grafton
- Sullivan

NEW JERSEY:
- Sussex
- Warren

NEW MEXICO:
- Union

NEW YORK:
- Chautauqua
- Chenango
- Franklin
- Herkimer
- Madison
- Orleans
- Schoharie
- Sullivan

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Alamance
- Alexander
- Alleghany
- Anson
- Ashe
- Avery
- Chatham
- Dare
- Davie
- Graham
- Granville
- Hertford
- Jackson
- Jones
- Lincoln
- Macon
- Madison
- Mitchell
- Montgomery
- Moore
- Pasquotank
- Pender
- Person
- Richmond
- Scotland
- Swain
- Tyrrell
- Watauga
- Wilkes
- Yadkin
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Burleigh
- Cass
- Cavalier
- Divide
- Grand Forks
- McHenry

NORTH DAKOTA—Cont.
- Morton
- Pembina
- Pierce
- Ramsey
- Richland
- Rolette
- Sargent
- Slope
- Steele
- Towner
- Walsh
- Ward

OHIO:
- Auglaize
- Clark
- Crawford
- Darke
- Erie
- Gallia
- Guernsey
- Harrison
- Henry
- Hocking
- Jackson
- Mahoning
- Meigs
- Mercer
- Miami
- Monroe
- Morgan
- Morrow
- Noble
- Paulding
- Perry
- Pickaway
- Pike
- Preble
- Putnam
- Ross
- Tuscarawas
- Van Wert
- Vinton
- Washington

OKLAHOMA:
- Atoka
- Beckham
- Garvin
- Greer
- Haskell
- Kingfisher
- Logan
- Love

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*

WIC High Participation Counties

OKLAHOMA—Cont.
Murray
Nowata
Pushmataha
Texas
Tillman

PENNSYLVANIA:
Blair
Cameron
Elk
Fayette
Greene
Juniata
Pike
Sullivan
Washington
Westmoreland
Wyoming

RHODE ISLAND:
Bristol

SOUTH CAROLINA:
Abbeville
Allendale
Berkeley
Cherokee
Chester
Clarendon
Dorchester
Fairfield
Lancaster
Laurens
McCormick
Newberry
Orangeburg
Pickens
Spartanburg
Union
York

SOUTH DAKOTA:
Hughes
Lyman
Pennington

TENNESSEE:
Benton
Chester
Decatur
Houston
Jackson
Lewis
Loudon
Meigs

TENNESSEE—Cont.
Pickett
Smith
Stewart
Trousdale
Unicoi
Van Buren

TEXAS:
Bailey
Bee
Comanche
Culberson
Denton
Dimmit
Garza
Gonzales
Hays
Jackson
Jim Hogg
La Salle
Martin
McMullen
Mills
Randall
Refugio
San Patricio
San Saba
Terrell
Tom Green
Travis
Willacy
Winkler
Zapata
Zavala

UTAH:
Daggett
Piute

VERMONT:
Addison
Bennington
Caledonia
Chittenden
Essex
Franklin
Grand Isle
Lamoille
Orange
Orleans
Rutland
Washington
Windham
Windsor

VIRGINIA:
Accomack
Alleghany
Amelia
Bedford
Botetourt
Buckingham
Buena Vista
Charles City
Charlottesville
Covington
Craig
Fairfax
Falls Church
Franklin
Fredericksburg
Goochland
Greene
Halifax
Hopewell
Louisa
Madison
Manassas Park
Martinsville
Mathews
Nelson
Poquoson
Portsmouth
Powhatan
Radford
Rappahannock
Richmond County
South Boston
Staunton
Surry
Sussex

WASHINGTON:
Chelan
Columbia
Garfield

WEST VIRGINIA:
Calhoun
Gilmer
Pocahontas
Randolph
Roane
Upshur
Wirt

WISCONSIN:
Ashland
Bayfield
Brown
Burnett

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*

WIC High Participation Counties

WISCONSIN—Cont.
- Door
- Eau Claire
- Florence
- Fond du Lac
- Forest
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Juneau
- Kewaunee
- La Crosse
- Langlade
- Lincoln
- Marathon
- Marinette
- Marquette
- Menominee
- Oneida
- Pepin
- Portage
- Price
- Racine
- Rock
- Rusk
- Sawyer
- Sheboygan
- St. Croix
- Trempealeau
- Vilas
- Walworth
- Waushara

WYOMING:
- Campbell
- Carbon
- Goshen
- Hot Springs
- Laramie
- Natrona
- Platte
- Sheridan
- Uinta
- Washakie

TABLE H-2

WIC Low Participation Counties

ALABAMA:
Madison
Mobile

ARIZONA:
Apache
Maricopa
Mohave
Navajo
Pima

ARKANSAS:
Boone
Bradley
Calhoun
Carroll
Cleburne
Garland
Greene
Jackson
Lee
Logan
Madison
Mississippi
Polk
Sebastian
Stone
White
Woodruff

CALIFORNIA:
Butte
Calaveras
Fresno
Lassen
Los Angeles
Mariposa
Orange
Placer
Riverside
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Joaquin
Santa Clara
Solano
Tehama
Tulare
Yolo

COLORADO:
Archuleta
Cheyenne
Clear Creek*
Conejos
Costilla
Delta

COLORADO—Cont.
Denver
Eagle
Elbert*
Garfield*
Grand
Jackson
Kiowa
La Plata
Mesa
Mineral
Montrose
Pitkin
Rio Blanco
Rio Grande
Summit
Weld

DELAWARE:
New Castle

FLORIDA:
Charlotte
Clay
Duval
Escambia
Flagler
Hamilton
Highlands
Monroe
Orange
Pinellas
Santa Rosa
Sarasota
Suwannee

GEORGIA:
Camden

HAWAII:
Hawaii
Honolulu
Kauai

IDAHO:
Blaine
Bonner
Boundary
Butte
Camas
Caribou
Franklin
Fremont
Gooding
Idaho
Jefferson

IDAHO—Cont.
Kootenai
Lincoln
Madison
Oneida
Power
Shoshone
Teton

ILLINOIS:
Clark
Douglas
Edgar
Kankakee
Kendall
McDonough
Mercer

INDIANA:
Benton*
Carroll*
Cass*
Clark*
Clinton*
Fountain*
Hamilton*
Hancock*
Harrison*
Jackson*
Jasper
Johnson*
Kosciusko*
Lagrange*
Lawrence*
Marshall
Miami*
Montgomery*
Morgan*
Newton*
Posey
Pulaski*
Rush*
Shelby*
Starke*
Tippecanoe*
Tipton*
Union
Vermillion*
Warren*
Washington
White*

IOWA:
Cedar
Grundy

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—*Cont.*

WIC Low Participation Counties

IOWA—Cont.
- Lyon
- Washington

KANSAS:
- Anderson*
- Barber*
- Barton*
- Butler*
- Clark*
- Clay*
- Cloud*
- Coffey*
- Comanche*
- Decatur*
- Edwards*
- Elk*
- Ellis
- Ellsworth*
- Geary*
- Gove*
- Graham*
- Gray*
- Hamilton*
- Harper*
- Haskell
- Hodgeman*
- Jewell*
- Johnson
- Kingman*
- Kiowa*
- Lane*
- Leavenworth
- Lincoln*
- Linn*
- Logan
- Marion*
- McPherson*
- Meade*
- Miami*
- Mitchell*
- Morris*
- Morton*
- Ness*
- Norton*
- Osborne*
- Ottawa*
- Pawnee*
- Phillips*
- Pottawatomie*
- Pratt*
- Rawlins*
- Republic*
- Rice*
- Rooks*

KANSAS—Cont.
- Rush*
- Russell*
- Scott
- Seward*
- Sheridan*
- Smith*
- Stafford*
- Stanton*
- Sumner*
- Trego*
- Washington*
- Wilson*
- Woodson*

KENTUCKY:
- Fayette
- Greenup
- Hardin
- Lewis
- Meade
- Mercer
- Nelson
- Pike
- Taylor
- Washington
- Woodford

LOUISIANA:
- Jefferson
- Lafayette
- Orleans
- Plaquemines
- West Baton Rouge

MAINE:
- Waldo

MASSACHUSETTS:
- Nantucket
- Norfolk

MICHIGAN:
- Isabella
- Kent
- Muskegon

MINNESOTA:
- Benton
- Chisago*
- Cottonwood*
- Faribault*
- Jackson*
- Kanabec*
- Lincoln
- Martin*
- Meeker

MINNESOTA—Cont.
- Renville*
- Rock
- Sibley*
- Watonwan*

MISSISSIPPI:
- Marshall

MISSOURI:
- Pike

MONTANA:
- Blaine
- Carbon
- Carter*
- Daniels*
- Fallon*
- Fergus*
- Garfield
- Glacier
- Golden Valley
- Judith Basin
- Liberty
- Madison
- McCone
- Musselshell
- Petroleum
- Pondera
- Prairie
- Roosevelt
- Rosebud
- Sheridan
- Sweet Grass
- Toole
- Treasure
- Valley
- Wheatland
- Wibaux
- Yellowstone National Park

NEBRASKA:
- Arthur
- Banner
- Blaine
- Boone*
- Butler
- Cedar
- Chase
- Colfax
- Cuming
- Deuel
- Dixon
- Dundy
- Frontier

---

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—*Cont.*

WIC Low Participation Counties

NEBRASKA—Cont.
- Furnas
- Garden
- Garfield
- Gosper
- Grant
- Greeley
- Hayes
- Hitchcock
- Hooker
- Jefferson
- Knox
- Logan
- McPherson
- Nance
- Pawnee*
- Perkins
- Pierce
- Polk
- Saline
- Sarpy
- Saunders
- Sioux
- Thayer*
- Thomas
- Valley
- Washington
- Wayne
- Webster

NEVADA:
- Eureka
- Nye

NEW JERSEY:
- Bergen
- Camden
- Middlesex
- Morris
- Ocean
- Somerset

NEW MEXICO:
- Bernalillo
- Catron
- Chaves
- Dona Ana
- Lea
- Lincoln
- Los Alamos
- McKinley
- Otero
- Quay
- San Juan
- Santa Fe

NEW MEXICO—Cont.
- Socorro
- Valencia

NEW YORK:
- Nassau
- Putnam

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Benson
- Dunn
- Golden Valley
- Grant
- Logan
- Oliver
- Sioux
- Stark

OHIO:
- Fulton
- Geauga
- Holmes

OKLAHOMA:
- Alfalfa
- Beaver
- Blaine
- Canadian
- Cimarron
- Delaware
- Dewey
- Ellis
- Grant
- Harper
- Oklahoma
- Osage
- Pawnee
- Roger Mills
- Washington
- Woodward

OREGON:
- Baker
- Benton
- Columbia
- Curry
- Gilliam*
- Grant*
- Harney
- Jackson
- Lake*
- Linn
- Wheeler*

PENNSYLVANIA:
- Berks
- Clinton

PENNSYLVANIA—Cont.
- Delaware
- Forest
- Montour*
- Northumberland
- Snyder*
- Union*

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Buffalo
- Campbell
- Clark
- Corson
- Deuel
- Dewey
- Douglas
- Faulk
- Hamlin
- Hand
- Hanson
- Harding
- Hutchinson
- Jackson*
- Kingsbury
- Marshall
- Mellette
- Shannon
- Todd
- Tripp
- Ziebach

TENNESSEE:
- Davidson*
- Dyer*
- Shelby

TEXAS:
- Anderson
- Angelina*
- Archer*
- Armstrong
- Austin
- Bandera
- Baylor*
- Bexar
- Blanco
- Borden*
- Bosque
- Bowie
- Briscoe
- Brown*
- Burleson*
- Burnet
- Callahan*
- Camp*

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—*Cont.*

WIC Low Participation Counties

TEXAS—Cont.
- Carson
- Cass*
- Chambers
- Cherokee*
- Childress*
- Clay*
- Coke
- Coleman*
- Collin
- Collingsworth
- Colorado
- Comal
- Concho
- Cooke*
- Coryell
- Cottle*
- Crockett
- Dallam
- Delta
- Dickens*
- Donley
- Eastland*
- Ector
- Edwards
- ~~Ellis~~*
- Erath*
- Falls*
- Fannin*
- Fayette*
- Fisher*
- Foard*
- Franklin
- Freestone
- Galveston*
- Gillespie
- Gray
- Guadalupe*
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardeman*
- Hardin
- Harris
- Harrison*
- Hartley
- Haskell*
- Hemphill
- Henderson*
- Hood*
- Hopkins
- Houston*
- Howard
- Hunt*
- Hutchinson

TEXAS—Cont.
- Irion
- Jack
- Jasper*
- Johnson*
- Jones*
- Karnes
- Kaufman*
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent*
- Kerr
- Kimble
- King
- Knox*
- Lamar
- Lampasas*
- Lavaca
- Lee
- Leon*
- Liberty
- Limestone
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Llano
- Madison
- Mason
- McCulloch*
- Medina
- Menard
- Midland
- Milam*
- Mitchell*
- Montague*
- Moore
- Morris
- Motley
- Nacogdoches
- Navarro*
- Newton*
- Nolan*
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Orange
- Palo Pinto*
- Parker*
- Polk
- Rains
- Reagan
- Real
- Red River
- Roberts
- Rockwall*
- Runnels*
- Rusk

TEXAS—Cont.
- Sabine
- San Augustine
- San Jacinto*
- Schleicher
- Scurry*
- Shackelford*
- Shelby
- Sherman
- Somervell*
- Stephens*
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Swisher
- Throckmorton*
- Titus*
- Trinity*
- Tyler*
- Uvalde*
- Van Zandt
- Waller
- Washington*
- Wharton
- Wheeler
- Wilbarger*
- Wilson
- Wise*
- Wood
- Young*

UTAH:
- Beaver
- Rich
- San Juan
- Sevier
- Utah
- Wayne

VIRGINIA:
- Albemarle*
- Bath
- Bedford
- Bristol
- Buchanan
- Chesapeake
- Clarke
- Colonial Heights*
- Danville*
- Emporia*
- Fairfax
- Hampton
- Harrisonburg
- Highland
- James City*
- Lexington*

---

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—*Cont.*

WIC Low Participation Counties

VIRGINIA—Cont.
- Loudoun
- Lynchburg*
- Manassas*
- Newport News*
- Norfolk
- Norton*
- Roanoke*
- Rockingham
- Shenandoah
- Southampton
- Suffolk
- Virginia Beach*
- Waynesboro*
- Winchester*
- York*

WASHINGTON:
- Asotin
- Benton
- Clark
- Ferry
- Garfield
- Island
- Jefferson
- Kitsap
- Lincoln
- Mason
- Pacific
- Pierce
- Thurston
- Whitman

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Hancock
- Harrison
- Jefferson
- Marion
- Preston
- Wayne

WISCONSIN:
- Calumet*

WYOMING:
- Lincoln
- Sublette*
- Teton*

---

*Counties in which a new WIC program had been instituted as of September, 1986.

TABLE H-3

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In WIC

ALABAMA:
- Escambia
- Henry

COLORADO:
- Otero
- Saguache

GEORGIA:
- Atkinson
- Bacon
- Baker
- Calhoun
- Charlton
- Clay
- Evans
- Hancock
- Irwin
- Miller
- Morgan
- Quitman
- Randolph
- Schley
- Stewart
- Talbot
- Taliaferro

ILLINOIS:
- Alexander

KENTUCKY:
- Estill
- Fleming
- Lee
- Martin
- Perry
- Robertson
- Wolfe

LOUISIANA:
- Caldwell
- East Carroll
- Evangeline
- Red River
- St. Helena
- Washington

MICHIGAN:
- Lake

MISSISSIPPI:
- Benton
- Claiborne
- Clay
- Franklin
- Greene
- Grenada
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Leake
- Montgomery
- Newton
- Noxubee
- Perry
- Tallahatchie
- Winston
- Yalobusha

MISSOURI:
- Carter
- Reynolds
- Stone
- Wayne
- Wright

NEW MEXICO:
- Union

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Hertford
- Madison
- Pender
- Swain
- Tyrrell
- Yancey

NORTH DAKOTA:
- Rolette
- Slope

OHIO:
- Pike

OKLAHOMA:
- Atoka
- Greer
- Pushmataha
- Tillman

SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Allendale
- Clarendon
- Fairfield
- McCormick
- Orangeburg

SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Lyman

TENNESSEE:
- Jackson
- Pickett

TEXAS:
- Bailey
- Bee
- Dimmit
- Gonzales
- La Salle
- Mills
- San Saba
- Willacy
- Zapata
- Zavala

VIRGINIA:
- Accomack
- Franklin
- Portsmouth
- Surry
- Sussex

WEST VIRGINIA:
- Calhoun

TABLE H-4

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In WIC

- ARIZONA:
  - Apache
  - Navajo

- ARKANSAS:
  - Bradley
  - Calhoun
  - Jackson
  - Lee
  - Mississippi
  - Polk
  - Stone
  - Woodruff

- COLORADO:
  - Conejos
  - Costilla

- FLORIDA:
  - Flagler
  - Hamilton
  - Highlands
  - Suwannee

- GEORGIA:
  - Camden

- KENTUCKY:
  - Lewis
  - Washington

- LOUISIANA:
  - Orleans

- MINNESOTA:
  - Lincoln

- MISSISSIPPI:
  - Marshall

- MONTANA:
  - Blaine
  - Carter
  - Garfield
  - Glacier
  - Judith Basin
  - Petroleum
  - Prairie
  - Treasure

- NEBRASKA:
  - Arthur
  - Banner
  - Blaine
  - Greeley
  - Hayes
  - Logan

- NEVADA:
  - Eureka

- NEW MEXICO:
  - Dona Ana
  - McKinley
  - Socorro

- NORTH DAKOTA:
  - Benson
  - Dunn
  - Grant
  - Logan
  - Sioux

- OKLAHOMA:
  - Delaware

- SOUTH DAKOTA:
  - Buffalo
  - Campbell
  - Clark
  - Corson
  - Deuel
  - Dewey
  - Douglas
  - Faulk
  - Hamlin
  - Hand
  - Hanson
  - Harding
  - Hutchinson
  - Jackson
  - Kingsbury
  - Marshall
  - Mellette
  - Shannon
  - Todd
  - Tripp
  - Ziebach

- TENNESSEE:
  - Shelby

- TEXAS:
  - Briscoe
  - Collingsworth
  - Concho
  - Cottle
  - Dickens
  - Edwards
  - Falls
  - Hall
  - Hardeman
  - Haskell
  - Houston
  - Karnes
  - Kenedy
  - King
  - Knox
  - Leon
  - Limestone
  - Madison
  - Mason
  - McCulloch
  - Medina
  - Menard
  - Mitchell
  - Motley
  - Real
  - Red River
  - Runnels
  - San Augustine
  - San Jacinto
  - Swisher
  - Uvalde
  - Wilbarger

- UTAH:
  - San Juan

- VIRGINIA:
  - Norfolk
  - Southampton

APPENDIX I

Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) September 1984

Page

Table I-1—Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): September 1984 303

TABLE I-1

Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
September 1984

Region, State & County

- Mid-Atlantic Region
  - Washington, D.C.
- Southeast Region
  - Louisville, KY
  - (Bullitt Ct.)
  - Halifax Ct., NC
  - Dyer Ct., TN
  - Map-South, TN
  - (Shelby Ct.)
  - Memphis-Shelby, TN
  - (Shelby Ct.)
  - Nashville, TN
  - (Davidson Ct.)
  - Weakly Ct., TN
- Midwest Region
  - Chicago Catholic Charities, IL
  - (Cook Ct.)
  - Detroit, MI
  - (Wayne Ct.)
  - Redlake Ct., MN
- Southeast Region
  - New Orleans, LA

Region, State & County

- Mountain Plains Region
  - Conejos Ct., CO
  - Costilla Ct., CO
  - Denver Ct., CO
  - Mesa Ct., CO
  - Rio Grande Ct., CO
  - Weld, CO
  - Polk, CO
  - Central Nebraska
  - (Sherman Ct.)
  - Omaha, NE
  - (Douglas Ct.)
  - Walthill, NE
  - (Thruston Ct.)
  - Lincoln, NE
  - (Lancaster Ct.)
  - Mid-Nebraska
  - (Buffalo)
  - Nebraska Panhandle
  - (Scotts Bluff Ct.)
  - Fairbury, NE
  - (Jefferson Ct.)
  - Pine Ridge, SD
  - (Shannon)
- Western Region
  - San Francisco Ct., CA

APPENDIX J

Sample Letters Requesting AFDC and WIC Data

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
J. ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
GERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS

ALAN J. STONE
STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL
ANN ROSEWATER
DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

DAN COATS, INDIANA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
HAMILTON FISH, JR., NEW YORK
THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
NANCY L. JOHNSON, CONNECTICUT
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., MAINE
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
DAVID S. MONSON, UTAH
ROBERT C. SMITH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM W. COBEY, JR., NORTH CAROLINA

MARK SOUDER
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7692

Dear :

As part of an ongoing assessment of the status of our nation's children, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families is conducting a study of several federal programs which provide benefits to children. The intent of the study is to publish a report which provides a snapshot of every county in the United States with regard to the support available for low-income children in that county. The Committee believes this level of detail is needed to discern regional variation in children's rates of participation which might otherwise go unnoticed in studies conducted at the national level.

The study will focus on programs geared toward low-income children covering health, nutrition, education and income maintenance. Our intent is to determine in each county the number of children participating in each of the programs at a given (single) point in time. We have chosen March, 1984 (3/84), as the data anchor point because data for all programs appears to be available either for that month or for the school year in which that month falls.

As Chairman of the Select Committee, I request your assistance in preparing this analysis.

Please provide FOR EACH COUNTY WITHIN YOUR STATE the number of infants and children receiving WIC supplemental nutrition benefits DURING MARCH, 1984. In those instances where counties have multiple participation sites, please compile participation data to achieve county totals. Where participation sites encompass multiple counties, estimate per county participation rates. (Please indicate where estimates have been made.)

Thank you for your help in completing this important study. If you have questions or need for clarification, please contact the Select Committee staff, 202/226-7660.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman
Select Committee on Children,
Youth, and Families

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLORIDA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, LOUISIANA
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, NEW YORK
TED WEISS, NEW YORK
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., ARKANSAS
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN
BRUCE A. MORRISON, CONNECTICUT
J. ROY ROWLAND, GEORGIA
GERRY SIKORSKI, MINNESOTA
ALAN WHEAT, MISSOURI
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
LANE EVANS, ILLINOIS

ALAN J. STONE
STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL
ANN ROSEWATER
DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
385 House Office Building Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515

DAN COATS, INDIANA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
HAMILTON FISH, JR., NEW YORK
THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., VIRGINIA
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
NANCY L. JOHNSON, CONNECTICUT
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., MAINE
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
DAVID S. MONSON, UTAH
ROBERT C. SMITH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM W. COBEY, JR., NORTH CAROLINA

MARK SOUDER
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE: 226-7692

Dear :

As part of an ongoing assessment of the status of our nation's children, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families is conducting a study of several federal programs which provide benefits to children. The intent of the study is to publish a report which provides a snapshot of every county in the United States with regard to the support available for low-income children in that county. The Committee believes this level of detail is needed to discern regional variation in children's rates of participation which might otherwise go unnoticed in studies conducted at the national level.

The study will focus on programs geared toward low-income children covering health, nutrition, education and income maintenance. Our intent is to determine in each county the number of children participating in each of the programs at a given (single) point in time. We have chosen March, 1984 (3/84), as the data anchor point because data for all programs appears to be available either for that month or for the school year in which that month falls.

As Chairman of the Select Committee, I request your assistance in preparing this analysis.

Please provide FOR EACH COUNTY WITHIN YOUR STATE data on the total number of AFDC cases, and the number of children in low-income families receiving AFDC benefits DURING MARCH, 1984. These data should include both AFDC and AFDC - U families. (Please indicate if AFDC - U families are included in the data and list separately if possible.)

So that the study can be completed and published as soon as possible, the Committee would appreciate receiving the data as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help in completing this important study. If you have questions or need for clarification, please contact the Select Committee staff, 202/226-7660.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER
Chairman
Select Committee on Children,
  Youth, and Families

APPENDIX K

Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985) Dollars

Congressional Research Service
The Library of Congress

Washington, D.C. 20540

TABLE K-1
Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985) Dollars
(millions)

			AFDC							
			State		Total		WIC		Head Start	
FY	Current $	1985 $	Current $	1985 $	Current $	1985 $	Current $	1985 $	Current $	1985 $
1970	2759.0	7789.8	1629.0	4599.4	4388.0	12389.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
1971	3279.0	8802.8	2723.0	7310.2	6002.0	16113.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
1972	3852.0	9980.4	3183.0	8247.0	7035.0	18227.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
1973	4178.0	10407.1	3434.0	8553.9	7612.0	18961.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
1974	4450.0	10174.2	3662.0	8372.5	8112.0	18546.7	10.4	23.8	NA	NA
1975	5177.0	10657.6	4316.0	8885.1	9493.0	19542.8	89.3	183.8	403.9	831.5
1976	5799.0	11146.1	4945.0	9504.6	10744.0	20650.7	142.6	274.1	441.0	847.6
1977	6221.0	11120.7	5345.0	9554.7	11566.0	20675.4	255.9	457.4	475.0	849.1
1978	6332.0	10573.5	5507.0	9195.8	11839.0	19769.3	379.6	633.9	625.0	1043.7
1979	6508.0	9850.3	5622.0	8509.3	12130.0	18359.5	525.4	795.2	680.0	1029.2
1980	7198.0	9592.3	6237.0	8311.7	13435.0	17904.0	707.9	943.4	735.0	979.5
1981	7763.0	9314.4	6731.0	8076.2	14494.0	17390.6	888.0	1065.5	818.7	982.3
1982	7800.0	8712.4	6812.0	7608.9	14612.0	16321.3	948.2	1059.1	911.7	1018.3
1983	8247.0	8899.0	7190.0	7758.4	15437.0	16657.4	1123.1	1211.9	912.0	984.1
1984	8583.0	8898.5	7486.0	7761.2	16069.0	16659.7	1386.3	1437.3	995.8	1032.4
1985	8964.0	8964.0	7803.0	7803.0	16767.0	16767.0	1491.9	1491.9	1075.1	1075.1

Note: Deflation of the current dollar expenditures was done using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. DAN COATS, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER; HON. THOMAS BLILEY, JR.; HON. FRANK WOLF; HON. BARBARA VUCANOVICH; HON. DAVID MONSON; HON. ROBERT SMITH; AND HON. BILL COBEY

INTRODUCTION

The Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families has spent nearly a year comparing counties which are in most ways incomparable. In order to come to certain conclusions, it ignored the facts that didn't fit. And the result is this report, Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children?

Safety Net Programs attempts to compare the extent of child poverty in the nation's counties using only two criteria: 1) the percentage of children in each county who live below a certain national uniform income level, and 2) the percentage of those children who use federal programs, AFDC, WIC, and Headstart. No other criteria are considered. The actual population of the counties and the concentration of poverty within them are not considered. Variations in the cost of living are not considered. The true needs of the children in the counties are not considered.

And the findings?

-- Logan County, Nebraska, with 92 children in poverty, 10 children receiving AFDC, and 1.5% unemployment, is a "child poverty county." (See Table A.)

-- Cook County, Illinois (including Chicago), with 295,616 children in poverty, 351,017 children receiving AFDC and 7.9% unemployment is not a "child poverty county." (See Table B.)

-- Garfield County, Montana, with 153 children in poverty, 5 children on AFDC, and 2.3% unemployment is a worse place for poor children than New York County, with 551,533 poor children, 531,846 children on AFDC and 8.2% unemployment. (See Tables A and B.)

-- The real problem areas for children are not New York, Chicago, Detroit, Newark, or any other large city. The real problems are in small, midwestern towns and rural communities.

-- The biggest problems are 31 small counties located in Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas, in which the average number of poor children is 263, the average unemployment is 4.9%, and the average number of children receiving AFDC is 20. (See Table A.)

Safety Net Programs reaches these astonishing conclusions through the use of a methodology which as been criticized by G.A.O. as seriously "doubtful." (See p.12, "Hunger Counties, Safety Net Programs, and the G.A.O.")

Part of a narrow push for a predetermined agenda, Safety Net Programs ignores most of the experience of the last few decades. In particular, it ignores the demographic changes which are responsible for the increases in child poverty. (See Part II, The Family and Economic Stability.) It also ignores the opposite changes in child poverty rates experienced by states with higher or lower AFDC payment standards. (See Part III, "Questions That Need Answers.")

By ignoring important facts and using faulty methodology Safety Net Programs disqualifies itself from serious consideration by those interested in improving our welfare programs. It is a personal disappointment to the many members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families who had hoped for a genuine contribution to the current discussion of welfare reform and families in poverty.

PART I

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

The principal finding of Safety Net Programs, according to its introduction, is that "record growth in poverty among children has not been accompanied by increased availability of key safety net programs." In particular, it argues, "support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need" and "are not most available where child poverty is greatest." In fact, Safety Net Programs finds nothing of the kind. For in all its 300-plus pages, it never locates 1) where child poverty is greatest, or 2) where programs are most needed.

Safety Net Programs is very similar to a January 1986 report by the Physician Task Force on Hunger in America. That report, Hunger Counties 1986 -- The Distribution of America's High-Risk Areas, was roundly criticized by the U.S. General Accounting Office in March 1986 for "methodological limitations that cast serious doubt on the accuracy of the estimated distribution of hunger by counties." Most of the methods criticized by G.A.O. in Hunger Counties 1986 are those employed by Safety Net Programs. A more detailed comparison of the methods used by the two reports will be presented at the end of Part I.

Independent of the G.A.O. analysis, we have six major objections to the methodology of Safety Net Programs. We believe that these six methodological problems prevent this report from assessing either the distribution of child poverty in the United States or whether programs are reaching those who need them most.

Assessing the Distribution of Child Poverty in the United States

Three Methodological Problems

1) Use of unequal entities as the unit of measurement.

If one is to measure the distribution of child poverty in the United States, it makes sense to find some unit of measurement small enough to determine the concentration of poverty within communities. But if that unit varies greatly in size and population, then the purpose of the endeavor is defeated. This is the case in Safety Net Programs. Child poverty is determined to be greatest in those counties with the highest percentage of children in poverty. But the population of the county is not taken into account. Therefore, Los Angeles County, because it has more children than many states have, taking in affluent and middle class suburbs as well as inner-city ghettos, is not determined to be a "child poverty county." But Arthur, Nebraska, with a population of 138 children total, is judged a "child poverty county." And this is determined regardless of the fact that Los Angeles County has 375,214 children in poverty while Arthur has 36.

Further, Safety Net Programs does not confine itself to comparing unequal counties; it also ranks states by the percentage of "child poverty counties" within them. As a result, states are treated disproportionately according to the size and population of their counties, not according to the actual number or percentage of children in poverty. For example, New York, with an actual child poverty rate of 19.0% is given only a 5% "child poverty county" rating, whereas Montana, North Dakota, North Carolina, and Texas all have actual child poverty rates less than 19.0%, but are judged far worse than New York on the basis of the percentage of "child poverty counties." Compared to New York's 5% rating, these states with lower percentages of children in poverty are given "child poverty county" ratings of 16%, 24%, 28%, and 31% respectively.

Finally, as a means of judging the actual distribution of the numbers (rather than percentages) of poor children, the county-by-county ratings for states are even worse. For example, California, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, and New York together have only 12 poverty counties, but almost 4 million poor children. In contrast, South Dakota alone has 36 poverty counties, but only 40,552 poor children.

2) Lack of adjustment for cost-of-living from county to county or state to state.

The federal government allows states to set their own "need standard" for AFDC payment levels largely because the cost-of-living varies greatly from one state to another. Therefore, the AFDC need standard for a family of four in 1986 is $698 in California, $823 in Alaska, $798 in the District of Columbia, and $749 in Pennsylvania, while it is $390 in Wyoming, $341 in Nevada, $450 in Kansas, and $413 in Tennessee. New York and Michigan even have different need standards for different counties. Though it might be argued that particular states have placed their need standard too high or too low, one cannot reasonably argue that cost-of-living differences ought to be ignored altogether. Yet this is precisely what Safety Net Programs does. Nowhere is allowance made for the fact that housing in Indiana, Iowa, or Nebraska is less expensive than housing in Califonia, Hawaii, or New York. Nor is any allowance made for differing income needs between large urban areas and small towns or rural communities. The absence of these considerations disproportionately weights the findings of this study against states and counties with lower costs-of-living.

3) Use of 1979 poverty data

Though Safety Net Programs measures program participation for 1984, it measures county-by-county poverty for 1979. Only national and regional poverty data are available for later years. The assumption is made that those counties with high child poverty rates in 1979 are most likely to have high child poverty rates in 1984. To a point, this assumption has merit. But the report does not adequately acknowledge its limitations. In Chapter III, the report speaks of the "failure of AFDC to meet increased need" in "child poverty counties." In doing so, it assumes not simply that the same counties are likely to be "child poverty counties" in 1984 as 1979, but also that these counties are likely to be the ones with increased poverty in 1984.

Assessing Whether Programs Reach Those Most in Need

Three Methodological Problems

1) Insensitivity to program eligibility requirements and goals other than those measured by income.

This report identifies poverty income with the need for all three programs; but the programs themselves do not. None of these programs is based on the assumption that all children in poverty will automatically need or be best served by that particular program.

WIC regulations require that a child be diagnosed as "nutritionally at risk" in order to be eligible for assistance. The purpose of the WIC program is to educate mothers about nutrition as well as to provide commodity assistance. It is not automatically assumed that poor mothers do not know what foods are good for their children or are unable to supply them with those foods. Rather, WIC works on the assumption that low-income families with children who are nutritionally at risk will probably need assistance, both educational and in-kind, in order to bring their children back to good health.

AFDC eligibility varies from state to state. About half the states allow a child to receive AFDC only if the father is absent or disabled. The other half allow AFDC-UP payments to the child of an unemployed father, but these cases represent less than one-tenth of all recipients. In addition to an "income test," AFDC also imposes an "assets test" for program eligibility.

All children in poverty, 3-5 years of age, are technically eligible for Headstart, but enrollment for any individual child is limited to two years. Further, the purpose and goals of the program dictate that program directors distinguish between those most and least in need of the program. Headstart is a program intended to break the cycle of poverty by addressing the developmental needs of children born into that cycle. A low income, in itself, does not create developmental or educational deficiency. It is absurd to suppose that a child will automatically need the benefits of a Headstart program if his father is temporarily laid off or suffers a serious decrease in income. A recently released interim report of the National Assessment of Chapter 1 (Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act provides compensatory education for disadvantaged children) concluded that for individual pupils, "the families' poverty status is only weakly related to student achievement," but that the intensity of poverty a child experiences -- measured by the duration of time in poverty, or the local concentration of poor children -- is closely related to achievement.

Many states are concentrating on limiting most children to one year of participation in the program. That means that even if all eligible children are served by Headstart, only about a third of them will be served in any particular year, because children are technically eligible for three years.

2) Insensitivity to other resources available to children in poor families.

The three programs whose participation rates are measured in this report represent a small fraction of the public and private resources available to children in low income families. Private organizations such as Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, Family Service America, and others perform major services for low-income families. Most state and local governments have their own programs, tailored to the needs of their own populations. Most states have General Assistance programs in addition to the federal programs available to low-income families.

The federal government alone has at least 70 programs having a direct impact on low-income children. These programs, listed and described in the Select Committee's 1984 report, Federal Programs Affecting Children, serve low-income families and their children through income maintenance (12 programs), nutrition assistance (9 programs), social services (19 programs), education and training (12 programs), health assistance (11 programs), housing assistance (4 programs), and tax relief (4 provisions). They include Food Stamps, Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income, Unemployment Compensation, National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Child Care Food Program, Summer Food Service, Commodity Assistance for Child Nutrition Programs, Special Milk Program, Commodity Supplemental Food

Program, Social Services Block Grant, Day Care Programs, Child Welfare Services, Federal Assistance to Refugees, Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children, Education Block Grant, Bilingual Education, Education for Migrant Children, Indian Education Programs, Education Programs for Refugee Children, Vocational Training, Job Training Partnership Act, Impact Aid, Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant, Family Planning, Childhood Immunization, Preventative Health and Health Services Block Grant, Indian Health Programs, Migrant Health Program, Community Health Centers, Public Housing, Leased Housing Assistance, Home Ownership Assistance, Rental Housing Assistance, Earned Income Credit, and the Child Care Tax Credit.

It would indeed be difficult to assess the success of safety net programs in reaching those most in need without taking into account the impact of any of these programs. The above mentioned programs comprise a far larger portion of the federal safety net than the three programs measured.

3) Monthly and annual data combined in determining participation rates.

In determining participation levels for AFDC, Safety Net Programs uses annual income data, but monthly participation data. Because a family may be below poverty during any particular month (and therefore eligible for some programs), yet above the poverty level for the year altogether, the mixing of monthly and annual data results in serious inaccuracies in estimates of the actual participation rates for AFDC and for the distribution of participation from county to county. For example, 10 of Massachusetts' 14 counties are shown to have AFDC participation of over 100%. The District of Columbia has a 164% participation rate. Kent County, Delaware shows an AFDC participation rate of 299%!

Differences That Make a Difference

The failure of Safety Net Programs to recognize other resources available to children in low-income families, program eligibility requirements and goals, differences in cost-of-living, and differences in county size and population are representative of a general failure to recognize any differences between low-income populations and their needs. The report makes no distinction between long-term or short-term poor, between the employed or unemployed, between the single-parent or two-parent family, between the child of a farmer experiencing a bad year and the child of a 16-year old single mother, between a child in a midwest small town or a child in an inner city slum. By failing to make these distinctions, this report tends to find more poverty in small towns than in big cities, and to judge poor children worse off in small towns and farming communities than in inner-city neighborhoods.

Table A takes those counties listed in Table E-13 of Safety Net Programs as "child poverty counties with low participation in AFDC, Headstart, and WIC," and adds additional data on the numbers of children in each county who are poor and who are receiving AFDC, and the unemployment rate for that county. These counties would be what the report describes as 1) "where child poverty is greatest" and 2) where "support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need." These, the report implies, are where child poverty and its consequences are at their worst.

In contrast, Table B lists six large counties which one might expect to see on a list of the worst child poverty counties in the United States. But as defined by this report, only three of these counties, New York County, Philadelphia County, and Essex County

TABLE A
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Headstart, and WIC

	Number of children in poverty - 1979	Unemployment Rates*	Number of children on AFDC	
			1979	1984
MONTANA:				
Carter	166	2.9	7	4
Garfield	153	2.3	5	4
Judith Basin	210	3.3	21	5
Petroleum	93	9.0	5	2
Prairie	208	4.0	3	7
Treasure	77	3.1	10	2
NEBRASKA:				
Arthur	36	1.0	0	0
Banner	81	2.1	9	6
Blaine	91	5.4	11	10
Hayes	101	3.9	2	3
Logan	92	1.5	10	12
NEVADA:				
Eureka	123	4.6	2	2
NORTH DAKOTA:				
Logan	302	2.6	18	15
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
Campbell	227	2.8	4	3
Clark	460	3.5	24	14
Deuel	418	5.9	25	17
Hamlin	496	3.8	31	21
Hanson	493	2.1	21	10
Harding	153	0.9	4	3
Jackson	574	4.5	190	17
TEXAS:				
Briscoe	273	7.0	36	26
Collingworth	459	6.6	56	36
Concho	220	7.0	18	19
Edwards	343	8.9	50	50
Haskell	554	7.1	138	83
Kenedy	58	4.7	4	3
King	40	6.3	0	3
Knox	438	8.3	133	102
Menard	217	10.1	16	31
Mitchell	796	15.3	107	97
Motley	213	1.9	15	14
Average	263.39	4.91	31.45	20.03

*Department of Labor figures for June, 1986.

TABLE B
Samples of U.S. Counties Without Low Participation In AFDC, Headstart, and WIC

Non-poverty Counties	Number of children in poverty - 1979	Unemployment Rate 1986*	Number of children on AFDC	
			1979	1984
ILLINOIS: Cook	295,616	7.5**	351,017	333,030
CALIFORNIA: Los Angeles	375,214	6.7	367,628	395,459
MICHIGAN: Wayne	138,682	8.7	188,941	209,163
Average	269,837	7.6	302,529	312,551
Child Poverty Counties				
NEW YORK: New York	551,533	8.2	531,846	497,278
PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia	128,540	6.7	176,490	147,673
NEW JERSEY: Essex	66,883	6.3	82,859	70,670
Average	248,985	7.06	263,732	238,540

*Department of Labor figures for June, 1986.

**Department of Labor figures for July, 1986.

(Newark, NJ), are "child poverty counties." The other three, Cook County (Chicago, IL), Los Angeles County, and Wayne County (Detroit, MI), are not considered "child poverty counties."

The contrast between the "child poverty, low participation" counties in Table A and the "non-poverty, high/moderate participation" counties in Table B is striking. The "child poverty counties" in Table A average 263 poor children per county. But the "non-poverty counties" in Table B average over 269 thousand poor children per county. The unemployment rates in these "child poverty counties" average 4.9%, well below the national average of 6.9%, while the unemployment rates for the non-poverty counties average 7.6%.

AFDC participation levels differ dramatically between the large and small counties as well. Participation levels for the six large counties average well over 100%, while participation levels for the small child poverty counties of Table A average under 15%. AFDC participation levels in these small counties are so dramatically low that they come close to being non-existent. Their contrast to the larger counties seems not simply a difference of degree, but a difference of kind.

Safety Net Programs explains that low participation on AFDC is caused largely by low payment standards. But the differences between participation rates for the counties in Table A and the counties in Table B cannot be explained so simply. The states in Table A tend to have average and above-average payment standards, but below-average AFDC participation levels. With the exception of Texas, each state in Table A has a significantly higher rating for payment standard than it has for program participation. But in Table B, most states (California and New York excepted) have higher ratings for participation than for payment standard. Illinois, for example, ranks 8th in the nation for its AFDC participation, but only 27th for its AFDC payment standard. (See Table III-10 Safety Net Programs, p.61.)

The differences between the low participation counties of Table A and the high participation counties of Table B indicate deeper, more fundamental differences in the populations studied. But these differences are ignored in Safety Net Programs. We will examine them further in Part II of our Dissenting Views.

"Hunger Counties 1986," "Safety Net Programs " and the G.A.O.

In its March 1986 report on Hunger Counties 1986, the Government Accounting Office listed nine methodological limitations which it considered to seriously affect the accuracy of the study's findings concerning the distribution of hunger in America. We have listed those limitations in Table C along with an indication of whether the G.A.O. found each limitation to be a major or minor problem and with a note indicating how this same methodology was used in the Safety Net Program study.

TABLE C
Comparison of Methodological Limitations in Hunger Counties 1986 and Safety Net Programs

GAO FINDINGS		
Limitation Hunger Counties 1986	Magnitude	Limitation Safety Net Programs
Use of 1979 data for poverty indicator	Minor	Same-Use of 1979 data for poverty indicator.
Insensitivity to numbers of food stamps non-participants.	Major	Same-Use of absolute counties participation rates rather than absolute numbers.
Use of participation data for one month rather than one year.	Minor	Same-Participation in WIC and AFDC were based on one month participation.
Insensitivity to assets test for food stamps	Major	Same-No consideration of assets test for AFDC or any other eligibility requirement for AFDC, WIC, and Headstart.
Use of regional averages to update number of persons eligible for food stamps.	Major	Similar-Regional averages used in place of county data for determining WIC participation.
Monthly and annual data combined in participation indicator.	Major	Same-Monthly and annual data combined in participation indicator for AFDC.
Sampling error in estimating number of persons eligible for food stamps.	Minor	Same-Both studies draw from Census Bureau county estimates of persons living below poverty
Inattention to low participation rates in low poverty counties.	Major	Similar-Report emphasizes "child poverty counties" as places where programs are most needed.
Indirect measurement of hunger.	Major	Similar-Indirect measurement of need for programs through exclusive use of poverty data.

Inattention to low participation rates in low poverty counties.	Major	Similar-Report emphasizes "child poverty counties" as places where programs are most needed.
Indirect measurement of hunger.	Major	Similar-Indirect measurement of need for programs through exclusive use of poverty data.

PART II

THE FAMILY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY

Demographic Trends: The Impact on Child Poverty and Welfare Dependency

By focusing exclusively on the five-year period between 1979 and 1984, Safety Net Programs narrows its scope to include only the economic effects of the period of inflation and recession of the late 70's and early 80's. Since then, inflation has dropped dramatically, and the effects of the recession on child poverty, which reached their peak in 1983, have decreased every year since. But even though these short-term effects are history, the United States is still living with the long-term, disastrous effects of the demographic changes of the past several decades.

By ignoring all that occured before 1979, Safety Net Programs ignores two of the most important economic and demographic developments affecting child poverty in this century:

1) between 1960 and 1985, poverty among children in two-parent families decreased almost by half;

2) during that same period the percentage of children living in female-headed families more than doubled.

Though the single-parent family has benefited from the same economic trends that helped the two-parent family, it has not benefited to the same extent. Poverty among children in female-headed families decreased almost 25%, from 72.2% in 1959 to 54.0% in 1984, but it still remained more than four times greater than poverty among children in families in which the father was present, 12.5% in 1984. Though children in single-parent families now make up about one-fifth of all children, they account for over one-half of all children in poverty. In 1960, when children of single-parent families made up about one-tenth of all children, they accounted for about one-fourth of all children in poverty.

The poverty status of single-parent families differs considerably according to the sex and marital status of the parent. Single fathers have poverty rates close to those of two-parent families, but they make up only about one-tenth of all single-parent families. Among single mothers, those who have never married have by far the highest poverty rate, 69% in 1983. Divorced and separated mothers have the next highest poverty rate, 44.1%; and widowed mothers have the lowest poverty rate, 34.1%.

Over the past 25 years, children of widowed mothers have decreased as a percentage of all poor children, while children of divorced, separated or never-married mothers have increased. In 1983, children of never-married mothers accounted for 26% of children of single mothers in poverty; children of divorced or separated mothers account for 64%; and the children of widows account for 10%. It should be noted that the percentage of children of never-married mothers is not the same thing as the percentage of children born out-of-wedlock. Children born out-of-wedlock may be born before the mother married or after she was divorced or separated from her husband. It is very likely that the percentage of poor children born out-of-wedlock is seriously underestimated by considering only children of never-married mothers.

According to a 1983 report by the Select Committee, U.S. Children and Their Families, out-of-wedlock births as a percentage of all births increased more than 450% in 30 years. For all races, the percent of children born out of wedlock increased from 4.0% in 1950 to 18.4% in 1980. For whites, the increase in out-of-wedlock births was from 1.7% in 1950 to 10.0% in 1980. For non-whites, the increase was from 16.8% to 48.5%. For blacks, out-of-wedlock births accounted for 55.3% of all births in 1980. In 1986, the out-of-wedlock birthrate among blacks now approaches 60% for the population generally, and surpasses 80% in some inner-city neighborhoods.

The poverty status of the children of never-married mothers does not seem to vary significantly between blacks and whites. According to a 1985 Ways and Means report, Children in Poverty, the "never-married" status of a mother has a more consistent effect on poverty status of her children than any other characteristic. The child of a never-married mother spends, on the average, 6 years in poverty if she is black, and 6.2 years if she is not black.

The relationship between marital status and welfare dependency is a strong one. According to a March 3, 1986 Ways and Means report on programs within the committee's jurisdiction, the percentage of AFDC families in which the father was never married to the mother increased from 27.9% in 1969 to 48.1% in 1983.

Once on welfare, young never-married mothers are very likely to remain on welfare for long periods of time. According to studies by David T. Ellwood and Mary Jo Bane of Harvard University, "a majority of people who have ever been on welfare have been on the rolls for a short time, less than five years. But a majority of the people on the rolls at any point in time are in the midst of long spells" of welfare dependence.

A recent study prepared for the Working Seminar on the Family and American Welfare Policy in conjunction with the Institute for Family Studies at Marquette University expands upon the work of Ellwood and Bane. Entitled, According to Age: Longitudinal Profiles of AFDC Recipients and the Poor by Age Group, the study uses the PSID (Panel Study of Income Dynamics) data to refine the distinction between short-term and long-term welfare recipients. It's findings indicate that older women who become eligible for AFDC after the breakup of a marriage are recipients for much shorter periods of time than younger women who became eligible while still unmarried. Among women who first receive benefits when they are 40 or older, 50 percent are no longer receiving benefits within two years. In contrast, women who first received AFDC benefits when they were less than 25 years old remained dependent on AFDC for a far longer time. Seventy percent received AFDC for at least five years, and more than one-third remained dependent on the program for at least 10 years. Charles Murray, author of the study, summarized its findings, saying that "for older and previously married women," welfare "tends to be a benign source of help." But "for the younger and never married, it tends to deform the marriage and labor-market behaviors that would otherwise enable them to achieve a productive adulthood." Teenagers and women in their early 20's who have babies out of wedlock "do not get married as often as their peers, do not remarry as quickly, and do not get into the labor market with the same kind of success."

Low Income and the Culture of Poverty

Safety Net Programs ignores the relationship between the breakdown of the family and the increase of poverty among children. It demonstrates a remarkable lack of interest in the real causes of poverty among children today. Safety Net Programs has confused two very different things: 1) poverty, which is low income, and 2) the culture of poverty. Poverty in this country is increasingly part of a culture of poverty, but Safety Net Programs does not acknowledge the difference.

The culture of poverty is marked by all of the forms of family breakdown discussed above: divorce, separation, and especially, out-of-wedlock births. In its most devastating form this breakdown of the family is a result, not of family break-up, but of the failure of families to form completely, with both a mother and a father. Unmarried mothers are younger and younger, and births to unmarried teens are growing faster than those to any other group. The result is not only poverty and dependence for young mothers and their children, but for the next generation as well. Raised in an environment in which fathers don't provide for their young and dependency on government is assumed, few children will develop the skills of self-sufficiency, or even the concept of personal responsibility. Young men will not strive to be good providers and young women will not expect it of their men. Family breakdown becomes cyclical, out-of-wedlock births become cyclical, poverty and dependence become cyclical. And the culture of poverty grows.

For the last 20 years, the culture of poverty in America has rarely been spoken of. In 1962, Michael Harrington, author of The Other America and early promoter of the War on Poverty was among the first to mention this "other culture in America" in 1962. "The most important analytic point," he wrote, "is the fact that poverty in America forms a culture, a way of life and feeling, that makes it a whole." He wrote about the breakdown of family life in the ghetto, the disastrous increase in the number of female-headed families, and in the growing trend of out-of-wedlock births. He described this new culture as different from the poverty of poor ethnic immigrants, lacking its hope and ambition to become part of mainstream America. But since 1965, when Daniel Patrick Moynihan issued his report on the breakdown of the black family, discussion of the subject has been closed.

In the last year, beginning with Bill Moyers' CBS report on "The Vanishing Family," discussion of the relationship between family and poverty has reopened. Washington Post reporter Leon Dash's series on teen pregnancy in the District of Columbia came fast on the heels of the Moyers report. Then in quick succession came Nicholas Lemann's two part series "The Origin's of the Underclass," and Mickey Kaus' article, on "The Work Ethic State" and the culture of poverty. One common theme runs through all these discussions: the breakdown of the family has caused the growth of a culture of poverty and dependence, a "permanent underclass" as Lemann and Kaus call it.

One of the primary results of this new discussion is the realization that the current array of "safety net" programs is not holding back the tide of poverty; on the contrary, many argue that these programs are partially responsible for the growth of poverty in the United States. They suggest the alteration or replacement of current safety net programs in order to help those caught in the culture of poverty make their way out. Further discussion of these arguments will be presented in Part III of our Dissenting Views.

Safety Net Programs and the Future of Poor Children

At this point it is reasonable to ask, "What contribution does Safety Net Programs make to the discussion of the future of the programs designed to help children in poverty?" The answer is, "None." Safety Net Programs is totally irrelevant to that discussion because it does not acknowledge the questions which brought it into being. Safety Net Programs ignores the effect of family disintegration on poverty. It stands alone in its ignorance of any difference between the temporary poverty of a stable family suffering an economic setback and the longterm dependence of a 16-year old unmarried mother and her child. It is ridiculous in its implication that poverty among children is more devastating in Prairie, Montana, or Arthur, Nebraska, or Eureka, Nevada than it is in Harlem, or Watts, or Chicago's West Side. As long as reports such as Safety Net Programs continue to ignore the fundamental relationship between the family and economic stability, they will continue to be irrelevant to the discussion of how to help poor children and their families.

PART III.

QUESTIONS THAT NEED ANSWERS

In order to make any worthwhile contribution to the national debate over welfare reform and families in poverty, we must include certain considerations in our deliberation. The following questions present themselves immediately:

-- How much do differences in county child poverty rates reflect differences in cost of living among counties?

-- Why do many children whose income makes them eligible for AFDC not receive it?

-- To what extent do AFDC payment standards affect participation rates in AFDC?

-- What causes the dramatic variations in the AFDC participation of poor children within a single state?

-- To what extent do AFDC payment standards affect the percentage of children who are in poverty?

-- How do developmental and educational levels of poor children in rural counties compare to those of poor children in inner city neighborhoods?

-- How do family attitudes about economic status, work and dependence, affect participation in "safety net programs?" How do these attitudes affect the ability of families to cope with the deprivations of low income?

-- How do high payment standards affect attitudes about work? How do they affect attitudes about family formation?

-- How do family composition and family attitudes affect children's needs for special nutritional and educational programs?

-- How do family composition and attitudes of the rural poor compare to those of the inner-city poor?

Only one of these questions (that concerning the relationship between AFDC payment standards and participation rates) was treated by Safety Net Programs, but they are all important to its findings. They do not require answers of pin-point accuracy, but they do deserve consideration and the most specific answers of which we are capable. Even if their answers are unknown to us now, we cannot ignore the questions. Unless we have good reason to believe that the answer, if known, would make little difference to our conclusion, we must at least recognize the existence of an unknown variable.

Safety Net Programs does not consider these questions. Instead, it rests on two basic assumptions which bypass these questions altogether:

1) All children living under a certain national income standard are alike in their need for WIC, Headstart, and AFDC.

2) The effects of these three programs will be the same for all children of poor families. There are no unintended or harmful

effects which should concern state or federal policy-makers.

Objections to the first assumption are evident from the discussion of methodology in Part 1. The second assumption, though less obviously so, is also quite controversial.

In particular, we refer not to WIC or Headstart, but to AFDC. The debate over the longterm effects of AFDC on poverty and dependence is too well-known to be simply ignored. Currently, we are in the midst of a nationwide experimentation on a variety of proposals to decrease work disincentives that seem to be built into the AFDC program. If there were no widespread perception of the negative effects of AFDC on work and family formation, there would not now be a national debate on work requirements and welfare reform. It is inexcusable for Safety Net Programs to ignore that debate or the possibility that some federal "safety net programs" may have unintended consequences. By doing so, it disqualifies itself from making any useful contribution to public policy.

Some Unintended Effects of Safety Net Programs

The 1985 Ways and Means report on Children in Poverty cites a study by Sheldon Danziger and Robert Plotnick which gives "the only sophisticated estimates available on the effect of increased cash transfers from 1967 to 1974 on the poverty rate after accounting for disincentive effects." In both years studied, cash transfers decreased "market income" among those receiving transfers, and therefore increased the "market income poverty rate." In 1967, when cash transfers totalled $12.6 billion*, the market income poverty rate was

---

*1983 dollars

5% higher than what it would have been in the absence of cash transfers. In 1974, when transfers totalled $26.6 billion*, the market income poverty rate was 12% higher than it would have been in the absence of transfers. As a result, after taking into account both the poverty-decreasing effects of the cash transfers and the poverty-increasing effects of the work disincentives caused by those transfers, estimates show that cash transfers decreased poverty rates by 0.7% in 1967 and 1.0% in 1974.

A forthcoming report of the Joint Economic Committee, Poverty, Income Distribution, The Family and Public Policy, expands upon the findings of Danziger and Plotnick and posits the existence of a "poverty-welfare curve." According to the estimates cited by the Ways and Means report, $12.6 billion in 1967 decreased the poverty rate by 0.7%, or 0.056% per $1 billion, but an additional $14.0 billion in 1974 decreased the poverty rate by only 0.3%, or 0.021% per $1 billion. It seems that additional cash transfers become less effective in reducing poverty because of the increased work disincentives which go with them. If so, then there may be a point at which the poverty-increasing effects of work disincentives "outweigh" the poverty decreasing effects of the cash transfers. In such an event, argues the Joint Economic Committee study, additional cash transfers could actually increase poverty. The study substantiates this theory through the use of regression analysis, finding statistically significant relationships between cash transfers beyond a certain level and increases in poverty.

Dealing specifically with the issue of children in poverty, the J.E.C. study raises more interesting questions. After controlling for differences on the rate of real economic growth, the study found a strong statistical relationship between the level of AFDC payments, by state, and the percentage change in the child poverty rate. The study found that those states with higher benefit levels tended to have increases in the rates of child poverty while states with lower benefit levels had decreases in child poverty rates.

---

*1983 dollars

Table D and E compare the changes in state child poverty rates of those 15 states with the highest AFDC payment standards and those 15 states with the lowest AFDC payment standards. Change was measured between the last two decennial censuses, 1969 and 1979. All but one state with high payment standards saw an increase in child poverty rates during that period. In contrast, all of the low-payment states experienced declines in child poverty rates. The average change among high-payment states was a 24% increase; the average change among low-payment states was a 16.8% decrease.

According to the Joint Economic Committee study, these different trends in child poverty between high-payment and low-payment states cannot be explained by differing economic conditions. After controlling for differences in economic growth, the positive relationship between AFDC payment levels and changes in child poverty rates remain strong.

Authors of the study obtained similar results from examination of county AFDC and child poverty data after controlling for differences in income and unemployment. These new findings, discovered through analysis of county data contained in Safety Net Programs, is explained in the Appendix to these Dissenting Views. (See Appendix, "The Impact of the Availability of AFDC Payments on Poverty Among Children," by Lowell Gallaway and Richard Vedder.)

COMPARING JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FINDINGS ON STATE CHILD POVERTY RATES TO SELECT COMMITTEE FINDINGS ON STATE PAYMENT STANDARDS

TABLE D

Percentage Change In Poverty Rate, 1969-1979, In States
With The Highest AFDC Payment Standards

Rank	State*	1979 Payment Standard For a 4 Person Family**	% Change In Poverty Rate***
1	Vermont	$524	+20.9
2	California	$487	+19.7
3	Washington	$483	+17.3
4	New York	$476	+49.6
5	Michigan	$470	+41.5
6	Wisconsin	$458	+16.9
7	Minnesota	$454	+07.3
8	Connecticut	$446	+46.2
9	Iowa	$419	+13.9
10	New Hampshire	$392	+19.0
11	North Dakota	$389	-10.1
11	Utah	$389	+00.9
11	Rhode Island	$389	+16.2
14	New Jersey	$386	+53.2
15	Massachusetts	$379	+48.9

TABLE E

Percentage Change In Poverty Rate, 1969-1979, In 15 States
With The Lowest AFDC Payment Standards

Rank	State*	1979 Payment Standard For a 4 Person Family**	% Change In Poverty Rate***
1	Texas	$140	-13.8
2	Tennesse	$148	-16.3
2	Alabama	$148	-19.5
4	Georgia	$170	-12.4
5	Louisiana	$187	-21.7
6	Arkansas	$188	-25.2
7	North Carolina	$210	-22.5
8	South Carolina	$229	-26.8
9	Florida	$230	-03.6
10	Kentucky	$235	-13.3
11	Arizona	$239	-07.8
12	New Mexico	$242	-17.2
13	West Virginia	$249	-23.9
14	Mississippi	$252	-26.4
15	Missouri	$270	-02.0

* Hawaii and Alaska not included because of extremely high cost-of-living.

** From Safety Net Programs, Table III-10

*** From Poverty, Income Distribution, The Family and Public Policy, Table 7-3. Joint Economic Committee.

Conclusion

We do not regard anything written in these Dissenting Views as pointing the way toward any one particular solution to the problem of child poverty in America. Indeed, Minority Members represent a wide diversity of opinion about the solutions to this problem. Rather, we are unified simply in our desire to see a better and more complete treatment of the most important subject our Committee has ever treated.

We have posed questions which we believe are important to this discussion, not because we think we know all the answers, but because we know that the solution to child poverty in America will depend upon our finding the answers to these questions. Nor do we believe that these are the only important questions to be asked. There may be some we have missed. But we do know that these questions, ignored in Safety Net Programs, are essential to this discussion.

We had hoped that the Select Committee would help Congress answer some of these questions and find a more complete solution to the problem of children in poverty. We still hope that it will. However, we no longer look for that help to come from this report. Safety Net Programs is not a serious examination of child poverty in the United States. It seems never to have sought a solution to a problem; it started with a solution and sought only that evidence which would support it. In order to achieve even that very limited goal, it had to ignore gaping holes in the evidence.

We are saddened that this document should ever come forth from the Select Committee, for we believe that it injures the credibility of a body which should have made great contributions to the debate on welfare reform. If it is still not too late to make those contributions, we are ready to start all over again and work together to that end.

Dan Coats, Ranking Minority Member
Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.
Frank R. Wolf
Barbara Vucanovich
David S. Monson
Robert C. Smith
Bill Cobey

APPENDIX

THE IMPACT OF THE AVAILABILITY OF AFDC PAYMENTS ON POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN

by
Lowell Gallaway
and
Richard Vedder

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

THE IMPACT AND AVAILABILITY OF AFDC PAYMENTS ON POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN

One of the major programs designed to alleviate poverty among the American population is Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The particular focus of this dimension of public policy is on improving the economic status of children, a group that may be unwitting victims of the economic circumstances of their parent(s).

The rationale of the AFDC program is a simple one. Payments under it are intended to enhance household income. In some cases the enhancement effects might even be sufficient to shift a household's income level from below the poverty threshold. That this could happen in a significant number of instances is indicated by the county by county AFDC participation rates calculated for purposes of the Committee report. In 1979, 125 counties provided AFDC payments to a greater number of children than those recorded as living in households with income below the poverty threshold. This obviously indicates that income supplements through AFDC are often available to households with incomes near the poverty threshold. What this suggests is that greater availability of AFDC payments to children has the potential of reducing the observed poverty rate among this portion of the American population.

At the other extreme, where AFDC payments are available to only a small fraction of poor children, as low as zero percent in some cases, it would be expected that the relative lack of AFDC payments for children would leave the incidence of child poverty virtually unchanged. Extended across the full range of the observed experience across the United States, the income enhancing effects of AFDC on household income should produce a negative relationship between their relative availablity and child poverty.

This surely would be the case if the only impact of AFDC payments were the income enhancing one. However, there is a large body of empirical evidence which indicates that income transfers of the AFDC type generate labor market disincentives which have the effect of reducing household income.(1) What this means is that the income enhancing effects of AFDC payments on household income are merely one part of an overall picture that is much more complex than the simple notion that more AFDC stipends obviously will produce reductions in child poverty. It is quite possible that the labor market disincentive dimension of AFDC income will more than cancel out the income enhancing effect, leaving less money income for some households, rather than more. Conceivably, this phenomenon could be strong enough to produce a positive relationship between the availability of AFDC income and the incidence of child poverty. Whether this is the case can only be determined by an examination of the available data.

The Empirical Evidence

The materials prepared for the Committee report are quite useful from the standpoint of determining the relative importance of the income enhancing and disincentive effects of the relative availability of AFDC payments for children. Especially helpful are the data compiled from the 1980 decennial census which describe the AFDC participation rate, defined as the number of children receiving AFDC payments as a percent of all poor children, and the child poverty rate. We have employed this information to conduct an analysis of the relationship between child poverty and AFDC participation for 3,098 counties and independent cities in the United

States.

Of course, AFDC participation is not the sole determinant of variations in the rate of child poverty in these areas. General economic conditions, as well as unique regional factors, also have an effect on levels of child poverty. In particular, it would be expected that differences in general economic conditions would be an important factor in accounting for county to county differences in the volume of poverty. Accordingly, we compiled information from standard sources describing the per capita level of income and unemployment rate for each of the 3,098 jurisdictions for which the AFDC participation and child poverty rate figures are available.(2)

Using these data, we conducted a multivariate analysis of the determinants of the child poverty rate in the United States.(3) Initially, we expected to find a negative relationship between child poverty and the level of per capita income and a positive link between unemployment and the magnitude of child poverty. The income-poverty connection is _very powerful_ in the anticipated direction. However, unemployment is only weakly related to the level of child poverty and, somewhat unexpectedly, in a _negative_ fashion. Therefore, we excluded it from the analysis. What about the impact of AFDC participation on child poverty? The analysis reveals a highly significant link. Most interesting is its direction. _Higher levels of AFDC participation by jurisdiction are systematically associated with higher child poverty rates._(4) While the effect is quantitatively small, nevertheless it is a statistically significant one. The empirical results are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Results of Analysis of Factors Influencing Child Poverty Rate, 3,098 Counties and Independent Cities, United States, 1979

Source of Effect on Child Poverty Rate	Magnitude of Effect	t-Statistic Associated with Effect
One Percentage Point Change in AFDC Participation Rate	0.0201	4.08
One Dollar Change in Per Capita Income	-0.0047	42.54
Being a Southern Jurisdiction*	5.5606	10.44
Being a Midwestern Jurisdiction*	0.2812	0.53
Being a Western Jurisdiction*	2.5554	4.35

Source: Author's calculations.

*Increase in child poverty rate relative to Eastern jurisdictions.

Conclusions

What conclusions may be drawn from these findings? Apparently, the labor market disincentive effects that accompany the provision of transfer payment income to households are sufficiently strong to overwhelm the income enhancement provided by AFDC. Consequently, contrary to the intent of the designers of the AFDC approach to dealing with the economic environment faced by dependent children in the United States, a greater availability of AFDC payments to a population has the effect of increasing the child poverty rate, instead of decreasing it. This empirical result suggests that the parameters affecting the outcomes of public policy with respect to the economic status of children are quite a bit more complex than commonly assumed.

FOOTNOTES

1. The pertinent literature is summarized in our *Poverty, Income Distribution, the Family and Public Policy*, Joint Economic Committee of Congress (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).

2. The basic data source is U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *County and City Data Book*, 10th edition (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983).

3. The statistical technique employed is least squares regression analysis. The child povety rate is the dependent variable and the independent variables are the 1979 level of per capita income, the unemployment rate recorded in the 1980 decennial census, the AFDC participation rate contained in the Committee report, and a series of "dummy" variables designed to measure any unique regional effects (other than income and unemployment levels) on the child poverty rate. Separate variables were constructed for the following regions: (1) the Southern (defined as the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central Census areas), (2) the Midwestern (defined as the East North Central and West North Central portion of the country), and (3) the Western (comprising the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States). These variables measure the general difference in poverty in these areas relative to the Eastern (New England and Middle Atlantic) portion of the country.

4. This finding is quite consistent with a number of other analyses of these relationship that we have conducted. These involve the use of both time series and cross-section data for the entire population and a number of demographic sub-groups, including children. This work is summarized in our *Poverty, Income Distribution, the Family and Public Policy, op. cit*.

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Additional Dissenting Minority Views

Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children? is not an effective use of the resources of the Select Committee for Children, Youth and Families.

The Select Committee for Children, Youth and Families was established because Congress recognized that we lacked effective policies to look after the needs of children and families. Congress mandated the Committee, through vigorous oversight, to develop policies to improve the programs that would meet those needs. With the release of this study, the Committee will once again fail its mandate.

The statistical foundation of the study has drawn strong and valid criticism. Its conclusion, that many children are not served by programs we have established to meet their needs, should surprise no one.

Until the Committee delves into the causes of family poverty and evaluates the weaknesses of current programs more rigorously, we in Congress will not be able to provide the leadership to address real shortfalls in assistance and real problems in the lives of poor children and families.

The Minority raises two worthy points in its dissent. The weaknesses within our poverty programs cannot be addressed without confronting the rise in single parent families headed by women and the corresponding rise in poverty among children. We cannot ignore evidence that our current system may encourage dependence as well as provide support.

Nevertheless, these are only two of a complicated array of factors that must be examined if we truly are to help children and their families out of poverty.

During the past two years, this Committee has released a number of studies. As the 99th Congress comes to a close, we want to register our dissent to the Chairman's decision to fund studies rather than genuine oversight to produce programmatic change. We know there is a need. Let us work together to address it.

Nancy L. Johnson
Nancy L. Johnson
Member of Congress

Jock McKernan
John R. McKernan, Jr.
Member of Congress

Hamilton Fish Jr
Hamilton Fish, Jr.
Member of Congress